

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the passing of this distinguished and courageous Member of the House of Representatives is not only a great loss to his district and to the State of Michigan, but also to the common man everywhere.

Personally, I feel a great void has been left in my world. JOHN DINGELL was my friend and adviser. The taking of my seat in the Senate was made easier for me because I knew I could rely on this great American for guidance and advice whenever I needed them.

I again extend my sincere sympathies to his widow Grace, and to his children, John Jr., James, and Jule.

In the Senate Chamber we are honored by the presence of the newest Member of the 84th Congress, JOHN DINGELL, JR., who I am certain will carry on in the great traditions of his noble and distinguished father.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I join with my colleague from Michigan in praising the fine work of Representative JOHN DINGELL. It was my privilege to know him very well during my service in the House of Representatives. No member of the Committee on Ways and Means was more diligent, more painstaking, and more devoted to his job than JOHN DINGELL, and certainly citizens of Polish extraction never had a better friend in Congress.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the tribute expressed by the Senator from Michigan on behalf of his late friend, the distinguished Representative from Michigan, Mr. JOHN DINGELL.

I knew Mr. DINGELL during my service in Congress and even before I came to Congress. I have the privilege of knowing his son, who has succeeded his very fine father as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Recently I had the great privilege of serving with the late Representative DINGELL on the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. On that Commission he served very ably and with high devotion and dedication to his responsibilities.

Representative DINGELL could be called a true liberal. He fought the liberal fight. He was very proud to be a friend of the workingman. He was proud to work in behalf of social legislation in the field of education, health, and welfare. He has left his mark on the public laws of this land. His fine work will live on in the lives of many people, who will have a better life because of what Representative DINGELL did for them.

I know that his son will follow in the footsteps of his very fine father and continue the record his father has made.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his very kind remarks.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I deem it a very great privilege to speak briefly this afternoon in eulogy of the late Representative DINGELL, of Michigan. He was a great liberal and a great Amer-

ican. I had the privilege of working with him very closely in many activities which involved matters of interest not only to the Congress but to the entire Nation. He represented a truly cosmopolitan district in Michigan. I am told that in his district 32 different nationalities were represented. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] spoke about Representative DINGELL's fine representation of the Polish constituency. I know from what I have learned from his intimate associates that he represented equally well every nationality in his district.

It was a great privilege to work closely with him on social security. I think I am safe in saying that we saw eye to eye on all matters which were of common interest. No man was more deeply interested in or more completely convinced of the necessity for fair, humane, just, and workable immigration laws. He was a tower of strength in the fight which we have waged in the Congress for several years to obtain a more equitable and a less brutal and cruel immigration policy.

He was a strong proponent of and always a fighter for fair and progressive taxation. He felt that taxation should be spread fairly and equitably in its demand on all the people, not upon any one class or group. What impressed me most, however, in my long association with Representative DINGELL was the fact that his concern was always for the little fellow. He protected the interests of all his constituents, large and small.

Deep down in his heart I know that he was moved most by the needs and aspirations and ideals of the little fellows, and he always went to bat for them, and usually with great success.

I mourn the loss of a very dear friend and associate. I think his passing has been a great loss not only to the community in which he lived and which he served so faithfully, but to the entire Nation which felt the imprint of his idealism, his hopes, and his determination.

It is a consolation to me to know that he has been followed in the House of Representatives by his son. I did not have the pleasure of knowing his son until a few days ago, when I first met him, but I have heard many excellent and fine things about him. I am very confident that he will be a very worthy successor to his great father, and I wish him success.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution with reference to the deceased Representative DINGELL, of Michigan.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representatives, I move that the Senate do now adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the order previously entered, until Monday, January 9, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 5, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of wisdom and understanding, Thou alone art the guiding intelligence and the supreme source of insight and inspiration when men assemble in their council chambers for deliberation and decision.

May all the legislation that shall be proposed and enacted by this session of Congress redound to Thy glory and help to bring to fulfillment our longings for peace on earth and good will among men.

Fill us with generous impulses and sympathetic attitudes toward one another and may we never become weary in seeking the well-being and welfare of all mankind.

Help us to live and labor together courageously and cheerfully, confident that nothing can ever impede the triumph of righteousness and justice and freedom.

Inspire our minds and hearts with the moral strength of humility and hope, of patience and perseverance and may all be done for the glory of God.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 3, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

THE STATE OF THE UNION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 241)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the Congress of the United States:

The opening of this new year must arouse in us all grateful thanks to a kind providence whose protection has been ever present and whose bounty has been manifold and abundant. The state of the Union today demonstrates what can be accomplished under God by a free people; by their vision, their understanding of national problems, their initiative, their self-reliance, their capacity for work—and by their willingness to sacrifice whenever sacrifice is needed.

In the past 3 years, responding to what our people want their Government to do, the Congress and the Executive have done much in building a stronger, better America. There has been broad progress in fostering the energies of our people, in providing greater opportunity for the satisfaction of their needs, and in fulfilling their demands for the strength and security of the Republic.

Our country is at peace. Our security posture commands respect. A spiritual vigor marks our national life. Our economy, approaching the \$400 billion mark, is at an unparalleled level of prosperity. The national income is more widely and fairly distributed than ever before. The number of Americans at work has reached an all-time high. As a people, we are achieving ever higher standards of living—earning more, producing more, consuming more, building more and investing more than ever before.

Virtually all sectors of our society are sharing in these good times. Our farm families, if we act wisely, imaginatively and promptly to strengthen our present farm programs, can also look forward to sharing equitably in the prosperity they have helped to create.

War in Korea ended 2½ years ago. The collective-security system has been powerfully strengthened. Our defenses have been reinforced at sharply reduced costs. Programs to expand world trade and to harness the atom for the betterment of mankind have been carried forward. Our economy has been freed from governmental wage and price controls. Inflation has been halted; the cost of living stabilized.

Government spending has been cut by more than \$10 billion. Nearly 300,000 positions have been eliminated from the Federal payroll. Taxes have been substantially reduced. A balanced budget is in prospect. Social security has been extended to 10 million more Americans and unemployment insurance to 4 million more. Unprecedented advances in civil rights have been made. The long-standing and deep-seated problems of agriculture have been forthrightly attacked.

This record of progress has been accomplished with a self-imposed caution against unnecessary and unwise interference in the private affairs of our people, of their communities, and of the several States.

If we of the executive and legislative branches, keeping this caution ever in mind, address ourselves to the business of the year before us—and to the unfinished business of last year—with resolution, the outlook is bright with promise.

Many measures of great national importance recommended last year to the Congress still demand immediate attention—legislation for school and highway construction; health and immigration legislation; water resources legislation; legislation to complete the implementation of our foreign economic policy; such labor legislation as amendments of the Labor-Management Relations Act, extension of the Fair Labor Standards Act to additional groups not now covered, and occupational safety legislation; and legislation for construction of an atomic-powered exhibit vessel.

Many new items of business likewise require our attention—measures that will further promote the release of the energies of our people; that will broaden opportunity for all of them; that will advance the Republic in its leadership toward a just peace; measures, in short, that are essential to the building of an ever-stronger, ever-better America.

Every political and economic guide supports a valid confidence that wise effort will be rewarded by an even more plentiful harvest of human benefit than we now enjoy. Our resources are too many, our principles too dynamic, our purposes too worthy, and the issues at stake too immense for us to entertain doubt or fear. But our responsibilities require that we approach this year's business with a sober humility.

A heedless pride in our present strength and position would blind us to the facts of the past, to the pitfalls of the future. We must walk ever in the knowledge that we are enriched by a heritage earned in the labor and sacrifice of our forebears; that, for our children's children, we are trustees of a great Republic and a time-tested political system; that we prosper as a cooperating member of the family of nations.

In this light, the administration has continued work on its program for the Republic, begun 3 years ago. Because the vast spread of national and human interests is involved within it, I shall not in this message attempt its detailed delineation. Instead, from time to time during this session, there will be submitted to the Congress specific recommendations within specific fields. In the comprehensive survey required for their preparation, the administration is guided by enduring objectives. The first is:

THE DISCHARGE OF OUR WORLD RESPONSIBILITY

Our world policy and our actions are dedicated to the achievement of peace with justice for all nations.

With this purpose, we move in a wide variety of ways and through many agencies to remove the pall of fear; to strengthen the ties with our partners and to improve the cooperative cohesion of the free world; to reduce the burden of armaments, and to stimulate and inspire action among all nations for a world of justice and prosperity and peace. These national objectives are fully supported by both our political parties.

In the past year, our search for a more stable and just peace has taken varied forms. Among the most important were the two conferences at Geneva, in July and in the fall of last year. We explored the possibilities of agreement on critical issues that jeopardize the peace.

The July meeting of heads of government held out promise to the world of moderation in the bitterness, of word and action, which tends to generate conflict and war. All were in agreement that a nuclear war would be an intolerable disaster which must not be permitted to occur. But in October, when the Foreign Ministers met again, the results demonstrated conclusively that the Soviet leaders are not yet willing to create the indispensable conditions for a secure and lasting peace.

Nevertheless, it is clear that the conflict between international communism and freedom has taken on a new complexion.

We know the Communist leaders have often practiced the tactics of retreat and zigzag. We know that Soviet and Chinese communism still poses a serious threat to the free world. And in the Middle East recent Soviet moves are

hardly compatible with the reduction of international tension.

Yet Communist tactics against the free nations have shifted in emphasis from reliance on violence and the threat of violence to reliance on division, enticement, and duplicity. We must be well prepared to meet the current tactics which pose a dangerous though less obvious threat. At the same time, our policy must be dynamic as well as flexible, designed primarily to forward the achievement of our own objectives rather than to meet each shift and change on the Communist front. We must act in the firm assurance that the fruits of freedom are more attractive and desirable to mankind in the pursuit of happiness than the record of communism.

In the face of Communist military power, we must, of course, continue to maintain an effective system of collective security. This involves two things—a system which gives clear warning that armed aggression will be met by joint action of the free nations, and deterrent military power to make that warning effective. Moreover, the awesome power of the atom must be made to serve as a guardian of the free community and of the peace.

In the last year, the free world has seen major gains for the system of collective security: The accession to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Western European Union of the sovereign Federal German Republic; the developing cooperation under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty; and the formation in the Middle East of the Baghdad Pact among Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, and the United Kingdom. In our own hemisphere, the inter-American system has continued to show its vitality in maintaining peace and a common approach to world problems. We now have security pacts with more than 40 other nations.

In the pursuit of our national purposes, we have been steadfast in our support of the United Nations, now entering its second decade with a wider membership and ever-increasing influence and usefulness. In the release of our 15 fliers from Communist China, an essential prelude was the world opinion mobilized by the General Assembly which condemned their imprisonment and demanded their liberation. The successful Atomic Energy Conference held in Geneva under United Nations auspices and our atoms-for-peace program have been practical steps toward the worldwide use of this new energy source. Our sponsorship of such use has benefited our relations with other countries. Active negotiations are now in progress to create an international agency to foster peaceful uses of atomic energy.

During the past year the crucial problem of disarmament has moved to the forefront of practical political endeavor. At Geneva, I declared the readiness of the United States to exchange blueprints of the military establishments of our Nation and the U. S. S. R., to be confirmed by reciprocal aerial reconnaissance. By this means, I felt mutual suspicions could be allayed and an atmosphere developed in which negotiations

looking toward limitation of arms would have improved chances of success.

In the United Nations Subcommittee on Disarmament last fall, this proposal was explored and the United States also declared itself willing to include reciprocal ground inspection of key points. By the overwhelming vote of 56 to 7, the United Nations on December 16 endorsed these proposals and gave them a top priority. Thereby, the issue is placed squarely before the bar of world opinion. We shall persevere in seeking a general reduction of armaments under effective inspection and control which are essential safeguards to insure reciprocity and protect the security of all.

In the coming year much remains to be done.

While maintaining our military deterrent, we must intensify our efforts to achieve a just peace. In Asia we shall continue to give help to nations struggling to maintain their freedom against the threat of Communist coercion or subversion. In Europe, we shall endeavor to increase not only the military strength of the North Atlantic Alliance but also its political cohesion and unity of purpose. We shall give such assistance as is feasible to the recently renewed effort of Western European nations to achieve a greater measure of integration, such as in the field of peaceful uses of atomic energy.

In the Near East we shall spare no effort in seeking to promote a fair solution of the tragic dispute between the Arab States and Israel, all of whom we want as our friends. The United States is ready to do its part to assure enduring peace in that area. We hope that both sides will make the contributions necessary to achieve that purpose. In Latin America, we shall continue to cooperate vigorously in trade and other measures designed to assist economic progress in the area.

Strong economic ties are an essential element in our free world partnership. Increasing trade and investment help all of us prosper together. Gratifying progress has been made in this direction, most recently by the 3-year extension of our trade agreements legislation.

I most earnestly request that the Congress approve our membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation which would assist the carrying out of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to which we have been a party since 1948. Our membership in the OTC will provide the most effective and expeditious means for removing discriminations and restrictions against American exports and in making our trade agreements truly reciprocal. United States membership in the Organization will evidence our continuing desire to cooperate in promoting an expanded trade among the free nations. Thus the Organization, as proposed, is admirably suited to our own interests and to those of like-minded nations in working for steady expansion of trade and closer economic cooperation. Being strictly an administrative entity, the Organization for Trade Cooperation cannot, of course, alter the control by Congress of the tariff, import, and customs policies of the United States.

We need to encourage investment overseas by avoiding unfair tax duplications, and to foster foreign trade by further simplification and improvement of our customs legislation.

We must sustain and fortify our mutual-security program. Because the conditions of poverty and unrest in less developed areas make their people a special target of international communism, there is a need to help them achieve the economic growth and stability necessary to preserve their independence against Communist threats and enticements.

In order that our friends may better achieve the greater strength that is our common goal, they need assurance of continuity in economic assistance for development projects and programs which we approve and which require a period of years for planning and completion. Accordingly, I ask Congress to grant limited authority to make longer term commitments for assistance to such projects, to be fulfilled from appropriations to be made in future fiscal years.

These various steps will powerfully strengthen the economic foundation of our foreign policy. Together with constructive action abroad, they will maintain the present momentum toward general economic progress and vitality of the free world.

In all things, change is the inexorable law of life. In much of the world the ferment of change is working strongly; but grave injustices are still uncorrected. We must not, by any sanction of ours, help to perpetuate these wrongs. I have particularly in mind the oppressive division of the German people, the bondage of millions elsewhere, and the exclusion of Japan from United Nations membership.

We shall keep these injustices in the forefront of human consciousness and seek to maintain the pressure of world opinion to right these vast wrongs in the interest both of justice and secure peace.

Injustice thrives on ignorance. Because an understanding of the truth about America is one of our most powerful forces, I am recommending a substantial increase in budgetary support of the United States Information Agency.

The sum of our international effort should be this: The waging of peace, with as much resourcefulness, with as great a sense of dedication and urgency, as we have ever mustered in defense of our country in time of war. In this effort, our weapon is not force. Our weapons are the principles and ideas embodied in our historic traditions, applied with the same vigor that in the past made America a living promise of freedom for all mankind.

To accomplish these vital tasks, all of us should be concerned with the strength, effectiveness, and morale of our State Department and our Foreign Service.

Another guide in the preparation of the administration's program is:

THE CONSTANT IMPROVEMENT OF OUR
NATIONAL SECURITY

Because peace is the keystone of our national policy, our defense program emphasizes an effective flexible type of

power calculated to deter or repulse any aggression and to preserve the peace. Short of war, we have never had military strength better adapted to our needs with improved readiness for emergency use. The maintenance of this strong military capability for the indefinite future will continue to call for a large share of our national budget. Our military programs must meet the needs of today. To build less would expose the Nation to aggression. To build excessively, under the influence of fear, could defeat our purposes and impair or destroy the very freedom and economic system our military defenses are designed to protect.

We have improved the effectiveness and combat readiness of our forces by developing and making operational new weapons and by integrating the latest scientific developments, including new atomic weapons, into our military plans. We continue to push the production of the most modern military aircraft. The development of long-range missiles has been on an accelerated basis for some time. We are moving as rapidly as practicable toward nuclear-powered aircraft and ships. Combat capability, especially in terms of firepower, has been substantially increased. We have made the adjustments in personnel permitted by the cessation of the Korean war, the buildup of our allies and the introduction of new weapons. The services are all planning realistically on a long-term basis.

To strengthen our continental defenses the United States and Canada, in the closest cooperation, have substantially augmented early warning networks. Great progress is being made in extending surveillance of the Arctic, the Atlantic, and the Pacific approaches to North America.

In the last analysis our real strength lies in the caliber of the men and women in our Armed Forces, Active and Reserve. Much has been done to attract and hold capable military personnel, but more needs to be done. This year, I renew my request of last year for legislation to provide proper medical care for military dependents and a more equitable survivors' benefit program. The administration will prepare additional recommendations designed to achieve the same objectives, including career incentives for medical and dental officers and nurses, and increases in the proportion of Regular officers.

Closely related to the mission of the Defense Department is the task of the Federal Civil Defense Administration. A particular point of relationship arises from the fact that the key to civil defense is the expanded continental defense program, including the distant early warning system. Our Federal civil-defense authorities have made progress in their program, and now comprehensive studies are being conducted jointly by the Federal Civil Defense Administration, the States, and critical target cities to determine the best procedures that can be adopted in case of an atomic attack. We must strengthen Federal assistance to the States and cities in devising the most effective common defense.

We have a broad and diversified mobilization base. We have the facilities, materials, skills, and knowledge rapidly to expand the production of things we need for our defense whenever they are required. But mobilization base requirements change with changing technology and strategy. We must maintain flexibility to meet new requirements. I am requesting, therefore, that the Congress once again extend the Defense Production Act.

Of great importance to our Nation's security is a continuing alertness to internal subversive activity within or without our Government. This administration will not relax its efforts to deal forthrightly and vigorously in protection of this Government and its citizens against subversion, at the same time fully protecting the constitutional rights of all citizens.

A third objective of the administration is:

FISCAL INTEGRITY

A public office is, indeed, a public trust. None of its aspects is more demanding than the proper management of the public finances. I refer now not only to the indispensable virtues of plain honesty and trustworthiness but also to the prudent, effective, and conscientious use of tax money. I refer also to the attitude of mind that makes efficient and economical service to the people a watchword in our Government.

Over the long term, a balanced budget is a sure index to thrifty management—in a home, in a business, or in the Federal Government. When achievement of a balanced budget is for long put off in a business or home, bankruptcy is the result. But in similar circumstances a Government resorts to inflation of the money supply. This inevitably results in depreciation of the value of the money, and an increase in the cost of living. Every investment in personal security is threatened by this process of inflation, and the real values of the people's savings whether in the form of insurance, bonds, pension and retirement funds, or savings accounts are thereby shriveled.

We have made long strides these past 3 years in bringing our Federal finances under control. The deficit for fiscal year 1953 was almost $9\frac{1}{2}$ billion dollars. Larger deficits seemed certain—deficits which would have depreciated the value of the dollar and pushed the cost of living still higher. But Government waste and extravagance were searched out. Nonessential activities were dropped. Government expenses were carefully scrutinized. Total spending was cut by \$14 billion below the amount planned by the previous administration for the fiscal year 1954.

This made possible—and it was appropriate in the existing circumstances of transition to a peacetime economy—the largest tax cut in any year in our history. Almost $7\frac{1}{2}$ billion dollars were released and every taxpayer in the country benefited. Almost two-thirds of the savings went directly to individuals. This tax cut also helped to build up the economy, to make jobs in industry, and to increase the production of the many

things desired to improve the scale of living for the great majority of Americans.

The strong expansion of the economy, coupled with a constant care for efficiency in Government operations and an alert guard against waste and duplication, has brought us to a prospective balance between income and expenditure. This is being done while we continue to strengthen our military security.

I expect the budget to be in balance during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.

I shall propose a balanced budget for the next fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

But the balance we are seeking cannot be accomplished without the continuing everyday effort of the executive and legislative branches to keep expenditures under control. It will also be necessary to continue all of the present excise taxes without any reduction and the corporation income taxes at their present rates for another year beyond next April 1.

It is unquestionably true that our present tax level is very burdensome and, in the interest of long-term and continuous economic growth, should be reduced when we prudently can. It is essential, in the sound management of the Government's finances, that we be mindful of our enormous national debt and of the obligation we have toward future Americans to reduce that debt whenever we can appropriately do so. Under conditions of high peacetime prosperity, such as now exist, we can never justify going further into debt to give ourselves a tax cut at the expense of our children. So, in the present state of our financial affairs, I earnestly believe that a tax cut can be deemed justifiable only when it will not unbalance the budget, a budget which makes provision for some reduction, even though modest, in our national debt. In this way we can best maintain fiscal integrity.

A fourth aim of our program is:

TO FOSTER A STRONG ECONOMY

Our competitive-enterprise system depends on the energy of free human beings, limited by prudent restraints in law, using free markets to plan, organize, and distribute production, and spurred by the prospect of reward for successful effort. This system has developed our resources. It has marvelously expanded our productive capacity. Against the record of all other economic systems devised through the ages, this competitive system has proved the most creative user of human skills in the development of physical resources, and the richest rewarder of human effort.

This is still true in this era when improved living standards and rising national requirements are accompanied by swift advances in technology and rapid obsolescence in machines and methods. Typical of these are the strides made in construction of plants to produce electrical energy from atomic power and of laboratories and installations for the application of this new force in industry, agriculture, and the healing arts. These developments make it imperative—to assure effective functioning of our enter-

prise system—that the Federal Government concern itself with certain broad areas of our economic life. Most important of these is:

AGRICULTURE

Our farm people are not sharing as they should in the general prosperity. They alone of all major groups have seen their incomes decline rather than rise. They are caught between two millstones—rising production costs and declining prices. Such harm to a part of the national economy so vitally important to everyone is of great concern to us all. No other resource is so indispensable as the land that feeds and clothes us. No group is more fundamental to our national life than our farmers.

In successful prosecution of the war, the Nation called for the utmost effort of its farmers. Their response was superb, their contribution unsurpassed. Farmers are not now to be blamed for the mountainous, price-depressing surpluses produced in response to wartime policies and laws that were too long continued. War markets are not the markets of peacetime. Failure to recognize that basic fact by a timely adjustment of wartime legislation brought its inevitable result in peacetime—surpluses, lower prices, and lower incomes for our farmers.

The dimensions of Government responsibility are as broad and complex as the farm problem itself. We are here concerned not only with our essential continuing supplies of food and fiber, but also with a way of life. Both are indispensable to the well-being and strength of the Nation. Consideration of these matters must be above and beyond politics. Our national farm policy, so vital to the welfare of farm people and all of us, must not become a field for political warfare. Too much is at stake.

Our farm people expect of us, who have responsibility for their Government, understanding of their problems and the will to help solve them. Our objective must be to help bring production into balance with existing and new markets, at prices that yield farmers a return for their work in line with what other Americans get.

To reach this goal, deep-seated problems must be subjected to a stepped-up attack. There is no single easy solution. Rather, there must be a many-sided assault on the stubborn problems of surpluses, prices, costs, and markets; and a steady, persistent, imaginative advance in the relationship between farmers and their Government.

In a few days, by special message, I shall lay before the Congress my detailed recommendations for new steps that should be taken promptly to speed the transition in agriculture and thus assist our farmers to achieve their fair share of the national income.

Basic to this program will be a new attack on the surplus problem, for even the best-conceived farm program cannot work under a multi-billion-dollar weight of accumulated stocks.

I shall urge authorization of a soil bank program to alleviate the problem of diverted acres and an overexpanded

agricultural plant. This will include an acreage reserve to reduce current and accumulated surpluses of crops in most serious difficulty, and a conservation reserve to achieve other needed adjustments in the use of agricultural resources. I shall urge measures to strengthen our surplus disposal activities.

I shall propose measures to strengthen individual commodity programs, to remove controls where possible, to reduce carryovers, and to stop further accumulations of surpluses. I shall ask the Congress to provide substantial new funds for an expanded drive on the research front, to develop new markets, new crops, and new uses. The rural development program to better the lot of low-income farm families deserves full congressional support. The Great Plains program must go forward vigorously. Advances on these and other fronts will pull down the price-depressing surpluses and raise farm income.

In this time of testing in agriculture, we should, all together, regardless of party, carry forward resolutely with a sound and forward-looking program on which farm people may confidently depend, now and for years to come.

I shall briefly mention four other subjects directly related to the well-being of the economy, preliminary to their fuller discussion in the economic report and later communications.

RESOURCES CONSERVATION

I wish to reemphasize the critical importance of the wise use and conservation of our great natural resources of land, forests, minerals, and water, and their long-range development consistent with our agricultural policy. Water in particular now plays an increasing role in industrial processes, in the irrigation of land, in electric power, as well as in domestic uses. At the same time, it has the potential of damage and disaster.

A comprehensive legislative program for water conservation will be submitted to the Congress during the session. The development of our water resources cannot be accomplished overnight. The need is such that we must make faster progress and without delay. Therefore, I strongly recommend that action be taken at this session on such wholly Federal projects as the Colorado River storage project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, on the John Day partnership project, and other projects which provide for cooperative action between the Federal Government and non-Federal interests, and on legislation which makes provision for Federal participation in small projects under the primary sponsorship of agencies of State and local government.

During the past year the areas of our national parks have been expanded, and new wildlife refuges have been created. The visits of our people to the parks have increased much more rapidly than have the facilities to care for them. The administration will submit recommendations to provide more adequate facilities to keep abreast of the increasing interest of our people in the great outdoors.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE

A modern community is a complex combination of skills, specialized build-

ings, machines, communications and homes. Most importantly it involves human lives. Disaster in many forms—by flood, frost, high winds, for instance—can destroy on a massive scale in a few hours the labor of many years.

Through the past 3 years the administration has repeatedly moved into action wherever disaster struck. The extent of State participation in relief activities, however, has been far from uniform and, in many cases, has been either inadequate or nonexistent. Disaster assistance legislation requires overhauling and an experimental program of flood-damage indemnities should be undertaken. The administration will make detailed recommendations on these subjects.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

We must help deal with the pockets of chronic unemployment that here and there mar the Nation's general industrial prosperity. Economic changes in recent years have been often so rapid and far-reaching that areas committed to a single local resource or industrial activity have found themselves temporarily deprived of their markets and their livelihood.

Such conditions mean severe hardship for thousands of people as the slow process of adaptation to new circumstances goes on. This process can be speeded up. Last year I authorized a major study of the problem to find additional steps to supplement existing programs for the redevelopment of areas of chronic unemployment. Recommendations will be submitted, designed to supplement with Federal technical and loan assistance local efforts to get on with this vital job. Improving such communities must, of course, remain the primary responsibility of the people living there and of their States. But a soundly conceived Federal partnership program can be of real assistance to them in their efforts.

HIGHWAY LEGISLATION

Legislation to provide a modern, interstate highway system is even more urgent this year than last, for 12 months have now passed in which we have fallen further behind in road construction needed for the personal safety, the general prosperity, the national security of the American people. During the year, the number of motor vehicles has increased from 58 to 61 million. During the past year over 38,000 persons lost their lives in highway accidents, while the fearful toll of injuries and property damages has gone on unabated.

In my message of February 22, 1955, I urged that measures be taken to complete the vital 40,000 mile interstate system over a period of 10 years at an estimated Federal cost of approximately \$25 billion. No program was adopted.

If we are ever to solve our mounting traffic problem, the whole interstate system must be authorized as one project, to be completed approximately within the specified time. Only in this way can industry efficiently gear itself to the job ahead. Only in this way can the required planning and engineering be accomplished without the confusion and waste unavoidable in a piecemeal approach. Furthermore, as I pointed out last year, the pressing nature of this

problem must not lead us to solutions outside the bounds of sound fiscal management. As in the case of other pressing problems, there must be an adequate plan of financing. To continue the drastically needed improvement in other national highway systems, I recommend the continuation of the Federal-aid highway program.

Aside from agriculture and the four subjects specifically mentioned, an integral part of our efforts to foster a strong and expanding free economy is keeping open the door of opportunity to new and small enterprises, checking monopoly, and preserving a competitive environment. In this past year the steady improvement in the economic health of small business has reinforced the vitality of our competitive economy. We shall continue to help small-business concerns to obtain access to adequate financing and to competent counsel on management, production, and marketing problems.

Through measures already taken, opportunities for small-business participation in Government-procurement programs, including military procurement, are greatly improved. The effectiveness of these measures will become increasingly apparent. We shall continue to make certain that small business has a fair opportunity to compete and has an economic environment in which it may prosper.

In my message last year, I referred to the appointment of an advisory committee to appraise and report to me on the deficiencies as well as the effectiveness of existing Federal transportation policies. I have commended the fundamental purposes and objectives of the committee's report. I earnestly recommended that the Congress give prompt attention to the committee's proposals.

Essential to a prosperous economic environment for all business, small and large—for agriculture and industry and commerce—is efficiency in Government. To that end, exhaustive studies of the entire governmental structure were made by the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—the reports of these Commissions are now under intensive review and already in the process of implementation in important areas.

One specific and most vital governmental function merits study and action by the Congress. As part of our program of promoting efficiency in Government and getting the fiscal situation in hand, the Post Office Department in the past 3 years has been overhauled. Nearly one thousand new post offices have been provided. Financial practices have been modernized and transportation and operating methods are being constantly improved. A new wage and incentive plan for the half million postal employees has been established. Never before has the postal system handled so much mail so quickly and so economically.

The Post Office Department faces two serious problems. First, much of its physical plant—post offices and other buildings—is obsolete and inadequate.

Many new buildings and the modernization of present ones are essential if we are to have improved mail service. The second problem is the Department's fiscal plight. It now faces an annual deficit of one-half billion dollars.

Recommendations on postal facilities and on additional postal revenues will be submitted to the Congress.

A final consideration in our program planning is:

THE RESPONSE TO HUMAN CONCERNS

A fundamental belief shines forth in this Republic. We believe in the worth and dignity of the individual. We know that if we are to govern ourselves wisely—in the tradition of America—we must have the opportunity to develop our individual capacities to the utmost.

To fulfill the individual's aspirations in the American way of life, good education is fundamental. Good education is the outgrowth of good homes, good communities, good churches, and good schools. Today our schools face pressing problems—problems which will not yield to swift and easy solutions, or to any single action. They will yield only to a continuing, active, informed effort by the people toward achieving better schools.

This kind of effort has been spurred by the thousands of conferences held in recent months by half a million citizens and educators in all parts of the country, culminating in the White House Conference on Education. In that Conference, some two thousand delegates, broadly representative of the Nation, studied together the problems of the Nation's schools.

They concluded that the people of the United States must make a greater effort through their local, State, and Federal Governments to improve the education of our youth. This expression from the people must now be translated into action at all levels of Government.

So far as the Federal share of responsibility is concerned, I urge that the Congress move promptly to enact an effective program of Federal assistance to help erase the existing deficit of school classrooms. Such a program, which should be limited to a 5-year period, must operate to increase rather than decrease local and State support of schools and to give the greatest help to the States and localities with the least financial resources. Federal aid should in no way jeopardize the freedom of local school systems. There will be presented to the Congress a recommended program of Federal assistance for school construction.

Such a program should be accompanied by action to increase services to the Nation's schools by the Office of Education and by legislation to provide continuation of payments to school districts where Federal activities have impaired the ability of those districts to provide adequate schools.

Under the 1954 amendments to the old-age and survivors' insurance program, protection was extended to some 10 million additional workers and benefits were increased. The system now helps protect 9 out of 10 American workers and their families against loss

of income in old age or on the death of the breadwinner. The system is sound. It must be kept so. In developing improvements in the system, we must give the most careful consideration to population and social trends, and to fiscal requirements. With these considerations in mind, the administration will present its recommendations for further expansion of coverage and other steps which can be taken wisely at this time.

Other needs in the area of social welfare include increased child-welfare services, extension of the program of aid to dependent children, intensified attack on juvenile delinquency, and special attention to the problems of mentally retarded children. The training of more skilled workers for these fields and the quest for new knowledge through research in social welfare are essential. Similarly the problems of our aged people need our attention.

The Nation has made dramatic progress in conquering disease—progress of profound human significance which can be greatly accelerated by an intensified effort in medical research. A well-supported, well-balanced program of research, including basic research, can open new frontiers of knowledge, prevent and relieve suffering, and prolong life. Accordingly I shall recommend a substantial increase in Federal funds for the support of such a program. As an integral part of this effort, I shall recommend a new plan to aid construction of non-Federal medical research and teaching facilities and to help provide more adequate support for the training of medical research manpower.

Finally, we must aid in cushioning the heavy and rising costs of illness and hospitalization to individuals and families. Provision should be made, by Federal reinsurance or otherwise, to foster extension of voluntary health insurance coverage to many more persons, especially older persons and those in rural areas. Plans should be evolved to improve protection against the costs of prolonged or severe illness. These measures will help reduce the dollar barrier between many Americans and the benefits of modern medical care.

The administration health program will be submitted to the Congress in detail.

The response of Government to human concerns embraces, of course, other measures of broad public interest, and of special interest to our working men and women. The need still exists for improvement of the Labor Management Relations Act. The recommendations I submitted to the Congress last year take into account not only the interests of labor and management but also the public welfare. The needed amendments should be enacted without further delay.

We must also carry forward the job of improving the wage-hour law. Last year I requested the Congress to broaden the coverage of the minimum wage. I repeat that recommendation and I pledge the full resources of the executive branch to assist the Congress in finding ways to attain this goal. Moreover, as requested last year, legislation should be passed to clarify and strengthen the 8-hour laws

for the benefit of workers who are subject to Federal wage standards on Federal and federally assisted construction and other public works.

The administration will shortly propose legislation to assure adequate disclosure of the financial affairs of each employee pension and welfare plan and to afford substantial protection to their beneficiaries in accordance with the objectives outlined in my message of January 11, 1954. Occupational safety still demands attention, as I pointed out last year, and legislation to improve the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is still needed. The improvement of the District of Columbia unemployment-insurance law and legislation to provide employees in the District with non-occupational-disability insurance are no less necessary now than 12 months ago. Legislation to apply the principle of equal pay for equal work without discrimination because of sex is a matter of simple justice. I earnestly urge the Congress to move swiftly to implement these needed labor measures.

In the field of human needs, we must carry forward the housing program which is contributing so greatly to the well-being of our people and the prosperity of our economy. Homeownership is now advanced to the point where almost 3 of every 5 families in our cities, towns, and suburbs own the houses they live in.

For the housing program, most of the legislative authority already exists. However, a firm program of public housing is essential until the private building industry has found ways to provide more adequate housing for low-income families. The administration will propose authority to contract for 35,000 additional public-housing units in each of the next 2 fiscal years for communities which will participate in an integrated attack on slums and blight.

To meet the needs of the growing number of older people, several amendments to the National Housing Act will be proposed to assist the private home-building industry as well as charitable and non-profit organizations.

With so large a number of the American people desiring to modernize and improve existing dwellings, I recommend that the title I program for permanent improvements in the home be liberalized.

I recommend increases in the general FHA mortgage insurance authority; the extension of the FHA military housing program; an increase in the authorization for urban planning grants; in the special assistance authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association; and continued support of the college housing program in a way that will not discourage private capital from helping to meet the needs of our colleges.

The legislation I have recommended for workers in private industry should be accompanied by a parallel effort for the welfare of Government employees. We have accomplished much in this field, including a contributory life-insurance program; equitable pay increases and a fringe-benefits program, covering many needed personnel policy changes, from improved premium pay to a meaningful incentive awards program.

Additional personnel-management legislation is needed in this session. As I stated last year, an executive pay increase is essential to efficient governmental management. Such an increase, together with needed adjustments in the pay for the top career positions, is also necessary to the equitable completion of the Federal pay program initiated last year. Other legislation will be proposed, including legislation for prepaid group health insurance for employees and their dependents and to effect major improvements in the civil-service retirement system.

All of us share a continuing concern for those who have served this Nation in the Armed Forces. The Commission on Veterans' Pensions is at this time conducting a study of the entire field of veterans' benefits and will soon submit proposed improvements.

We are proud of the progress our people have made in the field of civil rights. In executive-branch operations throughout the Nation, elimination of discrimination and segregation is all but completed. Progress is also being made among contractors engaged in furnishing Government services and requirements. Every citizen now has the opportunity to fit himself for and to hold a position of responsibility in the service of his country. In the District of Columbia, through the voluntary cooperation of the people, discrimination and segregation are disappearing from hotels, theaters, restaurants, and other facilities.

It is disturbing that in some localities allegations persist that Negro citizens are being deprived of their right to vote and are likewise being subjected to unwarranted economic pressures. I recommend that the substance of these charges be thoroughly examined by a bipartisan commission created by the Congress. It is hoped that such a commission will be established promptly so that it may arrive at findings which can receive early consideration.

The stature of our leadership in the free world has increased through the past 3 years because we have made more progress than ever before in a similar period to assure our citizens equality in justice, in opportunity, and in civil rights. We must expand this effort on every front. We must strive to have every person judged and measured by what he is, rather than by his color, race, or religion. There will soon be recommended to the Congress a program further to advance the efforts of the Government, within the area of Federal responsibility, to accomplish these objectives.

One particular challenge confronts us. In the Hawaiian Islands, East meets West. To the islands, Asia, and Europe, and the Western Hemisphere, all the continents have contributed their peoples and their cultures to display a unique example of a community that is a successful laboratory in human brotherhood.

Statehood, supported by the repeatedly expressed desire of the islands' people and by our traditions, would be a shining example of the American way to the

entire earth. Consequently, I urgently request this Congress to grant statehood for Hawaii. Also, in harmony with the provisions I last year communicated to the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, I trust that progress toward statehood for Alaska can be made in this session.

Progress is constant toward full integration of our Indian citizens into normal community life. During the past 2 years the administration has provided school facilities for thousands of Indian children previously denied this opportunity. We must continue to meet the needs of increased numbers of Indian children. Provision should also be made for the education of adult Indians whose schooling in earlier years was neglected.

In keeping with our responsibility of world leadership and in our own self-interest, I again point out to the Congress the urgent need for revision of the immigration and nationality laws. Our Nation has always welcomed immigrants to our shores. The wisdom of such a policy is clearly shown by the fact that America has been built by immigrants and the descendants of immigrants. That policy must be continued realistically with present-day conditions in mind.

I recommend that the number of persons admitted to this country annually be based not on the 1920 census but on the latest, the 1950 census. Provision should be made to allow for greater flexibility in the use of quotas so if one country does not use its share, the vacancies may be made available for the use of qualified individuals from other countries.

The law should be amended to permit the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to waive the requirements of fingerprinting on a reciprocal basis for persons coming to this country for temporary visits. This and other changes in the law are long overdue and should be taken care of promptly. Detailed recommendations for revision of the immigration laws will be submitted to the Congress.

I am happy to report substantial progress in the flow of immigrants under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. However, I again request this Congress to approve without further delay the urgently needed amendments to that act which I submitted in the last session. Because of the high prosperity in Germany and Austria, the number of immigrants from those countries will be reduced. This will make available thousands of unfilled openings which I recommend be distributed to Greece and Italy and to escapees from behind the Iron Curtain.

Once again I ask the Congress to join with me in demonstrating our belief in the right of suffrage. I renew my request that the principle of self-government be extended and the right of suffrage granted to the citizens of the District of Columbia.

To conclude: The vista before us is bright. The march of science, the expanding economy, the advance in collective security toward a just peace—in this threefold movement our people are creating new standards by which the future of the Republic may be judged.

Progress, however, will be realized only as it is more than matched by a continuing growth in the spiritual strength of the Nation. Our dedication to moral values must be complete in our dealings abroad and in our relationships among ourselves. We have single-minded devotion to the common good of America. Never must we forget that this means the well-being, the prosperity, the security of all Americans in every walk of life.

To the attainment of these objectives I pledge full energies of the administration as in the session ahead it works on a program for submission to you, the Congress of the United States.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 5, 1956.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President of the United States be referred to the Whole House on the State of the Union and that it be ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

THE LATE HARRY SANDAGER

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have an unhappy mission to perform. I have to acquaint the Members of the House with the fact that a former colleague of many Members has passed away. My predecessor in representation of the Second Rhode Island District, Harry Sandager, has gone to his eternal reward. Harry Sandager died on Christmas eve after suffering a heart attack.

One of the most overworked words in our language is the word, "friend." But, I want to say that in the passing of one of Rhode Island's most distinguished citizens I feel that I have lost a genuine friend. His sudden death cast a pall over the Christmas Day festivities in my home—and in the homes of a great many Rhode Islanders.

Harry Sandager was a grand person—and a gentleman in every sense of the word. Harry Sandager and I were political opponents during two vigorously fought campaigns. Harry Sandager fought hard, but he fought honorably. I have always been proud of the fact that our friendship became stronger as a result of these two contests.

Harry has been a prominent businessman in Rhode Island for the past 25 years. In his earlier years, he held down the desk of sports editor for the Pawtucket Times and he always evidenced a strong interest in newspaper work.

Mr. Sandager came to Washington first in 1919 as secretary to the late Congressman Walter R. Stiness with whom he was associated for 4 years. While working on Capitol Hill, he attended Georgetown University and George Washington University, receiving degrees from both institutions.

He was a member of Georgetown's first class in the Foreign Service school

and, in 1921, he was awarded the James A. Farrell prize for the highest general average in that school which has become so famous.

Mr. Sandager served for 8 years as a member of Rhode Island's House of Representatives and, in 1936, was elected Republican floor leader in that body. In 1938, he was elected to the United States House of Representatives to serve in the 76th Congress and represented the 2d District of Rhode Island in Congress until January 1, 1941. He was always very active in Republican Party affairs in Rhode Island and served for a time as Republican National Committeeman from my State. He enjoyed the honor of having represented his party at national conventions and, for many years, Harry Sandager was always consulted in considerations of Republican Party policy in Rhode Island.

At one time, Harry was president of the Southern New England Football Association and also of the National Roller-Polo League. He was an active member of the Doric Lodge, A. F. & M., in the Providence Lodge of Elks, the Providence Aerie of Eagles, and the Lions' Club of his hometown, the city of Cranston.

I wish to take this opportunity, and I know many of my colleagues join me, in extending to his widow heartfelt sympathy on the passing of such a gentleman. He was a credit to his background, his community, his State and the American way of life.

It has been said of another great man that nothing in his life became him more—than the manner of his passing from this mortal sphere. Harry Sandager suffered a heart attack while he was in the midst of a vigorous round of activity delivering Christmas presents to many of his friends, and to many less fortunate than himself—for whom he always wished the merriest of Christmases. May the Good Lord have mercy on his soul.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my good friend from Rhode Island in expressing my deep regret at the passing of former Congressman Sandager. It was my privilege to know intimately and well for many years the former Member from Rhode Island. I knew him when he was engaged in newspaper work and also as a Member of the Congress. He was a man of fine ability and a stalwart champion of Americanism. He was a devoted and loyal friend. His death will be genuinely regretted by all who were privileged to know him. My sincere sympathy is extended to his wife and family.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I came to the Congress with Harry Sandager. As two freshmen members we occupied offices just across the hall from each other.

While he remained here only two years the friendship we then formed continued throughout the years. I am very

much aggrieved to hear of his passing. It was typical, however, that he should pass away while engaged in activities he enjoyed most, expressing friendship and Christmas greetings to his friends and to the less fortunate. I extend to his widow my sincere sympathy.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague in paying this tribute to Harry Sandager. Although we were of different political faiths, we always worked together for the good and the welfare not only of our State but of the Federal Government, and in the passing of Harry Sandager not only the State of Rhode Island, not only his family, but the country has lost a great citizen.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have learned with deep regret of the passing of our former friend and colleague, Harry Sandager, of Rhode Island.

Born in 1887, he played an active part in public life in the field of journalism; as a Representative in the Rhode Island General Assembly for 8 years; as a Member of the 76th Congress, and as Republican national committeeman for the State of Rhode Island.

He had a very wide circle of friends, among whom I have been happy to be included. I have valued his friendship ever since the days of our service here together in this House.

I join in heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Sandager and to all those close to him.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. TUMULTY (at the request of Mr. MURRAY of Illinois) was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

THE LATE CHARLES FRANKLIN WEST

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform you of the passing of a former Member of this House, the Honorable Charles Franklin West. Mr. West represented the 17th Congressional Dis-

trict of Ohio for two terms, the 72d and 73d Congresses.

Before coming to Congress, Charles West was a teacher of political science at Denison University, the College of Wooster, and Tufts College. He attended Ohio Wesleyan University and completed his work for a bachelor's degree at Harvard. After his service in the House of Representatives, Mr. West, who was a member of the Democrat Party, served in the capacity of personal contact man for President Roosevelt. He was Under Secretary of the Interior and had served as vice consul at Naples, Italy, under President Wilson.

I am sure my colleagues here assembled join with me in extending our sincere sympathy to his wife, his brother, his two sisters, and his many friends.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of knowing Charley West. He served with me on the Ways and Means Committee and in that service he showed that he was a very well-educated man. He readily digested most of the very complicated matters that came before us. He frequently discussed these complicated matters with a fair attitude. I extend to his family my most sincere sympathy.

NATIONAL FLOOD INDEMNITY ACT OF 1956

Mr. WILCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the administration, I have today introduced a bill to provide for an experimental national flood indemnity and reinsurance program and for other purposes.

The bill, entitled "National Flood Indemnity Act of 1956," provides for an experimental 5-year program of indemnity and reinsurance to help alleviate the economic hardship which our people suffer as a result of floods. It makes provision for a voluntary Federal-State program of indemnities and a Federal program of reinsurance of flood risks. Both programs would be administered by the Federal Government, utilizing private insurance facilities to the fullest extent possible. States participating in the indemnity program, however, would make certain financial contributions which would be matched by the Federal Government.

The total annual loss from floods in the United States is roughly estimated to be \$225 million. However, the proposed legislation does not attempt to cover all of this loss. A substantial portion of flood loss relates to types of personal property for which insurance from private companies is already available, and losses on growing crops covered by the Federal Crop Insurance program. Also, as will be explained, there are lim-

itations in the bill on the indemnity coverage available to any one person, and requirements for coinsurance.

Because of the novel and complex problems involved and the lack of experience by the Federal Government and private industry in the field, the programs should be experimental in nature and flexible. Consequently, the authorities proposed in this bill are more limited in scope and broader in methods of operation than would perhaps be desirable if records of past experience in flood insurance existed.

Under the terms of this bill the Housing and Home Finance Administrator would be authorized, upon the payment of a fee by the property owner, to issue indemnity contracts protecting the owner against losses due to floods. Such contracts may cover real property, business inventories, stored agricultural commodities, household effects, and such other personal property as the Administrator may determine.

The bill would require that the fee paid by the property owner equal at least 60 percent of an estimated rate, which would be the rate necessary to cover all losses, except administrative expenses, over a reasonable period of years. The amount of the difference between the fee charged the property owner and the estimated rate would be shared equally by the individual State in which the property covered is located and the Federal Government. The fees charged plus the Federal and State contributions would be placed in a Federal flood indemnity fund from which all losses would be paid.

The provision for Federal and State contributions is made in recognition of the fact that the fees to be charged owners of property may otherwise be so high as to defeat the purposes of the bill. The fee required by the bill, however, is a minimum amount which can be adjusted after a creditable experience is developed under the indemnity program. To the extent this can be done, Federal and State contributions might be reduced. This affords the means of gradually eliminating subsidies, as experience is gained, and placing the program in a position to be taken over by private insurance companies.

The maximum coverage under this bill is limited to \$250,000 for any one corporation, individual, State, or municipality. The purpose of the limitation is to spread the risk until greater experience is gained. This bill also contains coinsurance provisions which reduce the amount of approved claims by \$300 plus 10 percent of the remainder. This amount and percentage may be increased by the Administrator. The purpose of this provision is, first, to eliminate small nuisance claims, and, secondly, to encourage people to protect their property against flood risks and assume a portion of the risk involved.

The Administrator is authorized to issue indemnity contracts in an aggregate amount of \$1,900,000,000. With the consent of the President this authorization may be increased by \$1 billion.

The Administrator would be authorized to make an equitable distribution of

these amounts throughout the United States.

This bill also authorizes the Administrator to reinsure private insurance companies under any plan of reinsurance which he believes would best effectuate the purposes of the act, against losses on insurance policies issued by such companies covering flood risks. He is required to charge a premium for such reinsurance which, in his judgment, would be adequate to cover all claims for losses. The reinsurance authorization is limited to \$100 million because it is anticipated that private insurance companies generally will not be willing to participate in the program until the Federal Government has developed actuarial experience covering flood risks. It is recognized, however, that the reinsurance program can serve as a convenient vehicle for transferring these programs back to private enterprise. The Administrator therefore is required by the bill to consult with representatives of the insurance industry and make continuing surveys and studies to determine methods to expand the reinsurance program.

In the administration of these programs the Administrator is required to make the maximum use of private facilities such as private insurance companies, established insurance agents, and brokers and established insurance adjustment organizations where consistent with providing protection at minimum cost. The bill contains adequate safeguards against competition with private enterprise in the insurance business. No operation could be started or continued by the Government under the bill if private companies are prepared to handle it.

FLOOD RELIEF, REHABILITATION AND PROTECTION, AND FOR DISASTER INSURANCE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I introduced, on Tuesday, January 3, several bills pertaining to flood relief, rehabilitation and protection, and for disaster insurance.

Some of these measures I have introduced in previous sessions of Congress. All of them are presently urgently needed in order to repair the tremendous damage done by recent floods in the Northeast or to protect against recurrence of these great natural disasters.

I would like to emphasize that I have introduced a bill to appropriate immediate funds for expedited preliminary planning and construction of necessary flood-control works in Massachusetts, which is designed to minimize delays in getting some vitally needed projects under way without waiting for the regular 1956-57 appropriation bill for flood control.

It is my personal belief that many, and I hope all of the projects mentioned in this bill, will be covered by the re-

port of the Bureau of the Budget, which should be filed with Congress in the near future for supplemental 1955-56 Army engineer funds. However, in order to clarify the situation and to make sure that all necessary projects of this kind shall be promptly before the Appropriations Committee, I felt that it was highly desirable to file this bill and request that it and the other bills designed to cope with the great problems posed by past and prospective floods in our Northeast area be expeditiously considered and acted upon.

In another speech, I will detail the scope and intensity of the great disaster which befell my district and other sections of the Northeast last August 19, and also the work of our Massachusetts delegation, and our special committee on flood prevention and relief, of which I am chairman.

It is hardly necessary, because of the widespread knowledge of the effects of this holocaust and other recent storms of devastating character, for me to elaborate at any great length or in voluminous detail the loss of life which was suffered and the damage which was done. I feel that Members of Congress, being well informed about these terrible disasters, and in addition the one which recently struck parts of the west coast with such devastating force, will be very anxious to cooperate in taking every possible expeditious action which Congress can take to alleviate the effects and to forestall the recurrence of the effects of these terrible visitations of nature.

In this connection, the report of our committee is very comprehensive and descriptive and I hope it will be illuminating to Members of Congress as covering the situation in Massachusetts. Let me state, however, that several other States were grievously affected and the question is of such scope and seriousness that it requires action by the Congress on an emergency basis if we are to forestall the devastating effects of future natural disasters of this character.

Among these measures is a bill to provide disaster insurance modeled largely after the principle of the War Damage Corporation program, a bill to expand and improve the weather service by providing more extensive and more effective forecasting of great storms through an accelerated weather-research program, general relief measures, so-called, to deal with problems of ordinary men and women who suffer serious losses, in some cases of all their property and belongings, in these storms and floods by providing direct relief for all sufferers of natural disasters.

Liberalization of restrictions on the operation of the Federal disaster relief program is urgently required, and to this end I introduced two bills so as to permit the responsible Government agency to make disbursements of Federal money in providing direct relief to sufferers of a major disaster. The first bill would permit permanent replacement and repair of public facilities destroyed in a natural disaster—not temporary repairs as now provided by law—and also make available such sums as are required to carry out needed relief. The second bill to liberalize Federal disaster relief laws

would establish a \$50-million fund to be disbursed without regard to present limitations in the Disaster Relief Act. This fund would be used for the furnishing of services, materials, and payments for relief work in the flood-stricken areas of the Northeast and California or elsewhere in the Nation as the need may arise.

I also introduced a series of tax-relief bills and earnestly hope they will have the sympathetic study and consideration of our Committee on Ways and Means. The first measure establishes new depreciation credits for property restored after a natural disaster. The second would permit individuals and corporations to obtain full tax credits over and above the present deduction rates for charitable gifts when these contributions are made to disaster relief funds such as the American Red Cross or to local relief organizations.

The third tax bill seeks to channel corporation profits into employee welfare and rehabilitation work. Thus, the bill would permit a corporation to disburse its profits into the repairing or rebuilding a home of an employee damaged or destroyed in a natural disaster.

In view of the lack of direct aid from the Federal Government in time of disaster I introduced a bill to establish a Federal Disaster Claims Commission to be implemented with an appropriation of \$100 million to extend adequate relief to individuals stricken by disaster.

I hope that these sound, well-considered and most desirable measures, which I am sponsoring in cooperation with my colleagues, will have the early, vigorous attention and support of the Congress. I am not concerned with pride of authorship in these measures and if other similar bills are proposed containing the principle of my bills, I will enthusiastically and vigorously support them. The important thing is to get action—planning, construction, rehabilitation, relief, insurance, and protection as soon as possible. The situation is urgent.

I respectfully urge and plead for immediate consideration of the entire disaster problem. It must be promptly solved by Congress within the framework of the Government and in line with needs as well as the rights of the States and local communities.

The texts of my bills follow:

House Joint Resolution 450

Joint resolution making additional appropriations for disaster relief for the fiscal year 1956, and for other purposes

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, the following sum:

For an additional amount for "Disaster relief," \$50,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1957, to be expended without regard to the limitation in section 8 of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 875), to carry out assistance and rehabilitation, including the furnishing of services, materials, and payments for relief work in the areas in the Northeast and California, stricken by floods in 1955.

H. R. 7944

A bill creating a Government-owned corporation to insure against certain disasters

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Disaster Relief Corporation Charter Act."

SEC. 2. There is hereby created a body corporate to be known as the "National Disaster Relief Corporation" (referred to in this act as the "Corporation") which shall be an agency and instrumentality of the United States.

SEC. 3. The Corporation shall have its principal office in the District of Columbia and may establish offices in such other places as it may deem appropriate in the conduct of its business.

SEC. 4. (a) The objects and purposes of the Corporation shall be to provide through insurance, reinsurance, or otherwise, reasonable protection to all persons against loss of or damage to property, real or personal, which may result from a catastrophe determined by the President to be a major disaster for the purposes of the act entitled "An act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes," approved September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U. S. C. secs. 1855-1855g).

(b) The Corporation shall establish, from time to time, uniform rates for each type of property with respect to which protection is made available under this act, and, in order to establish a basis for such rates, the Corporation shall establish the average risk of loss on all property of such type in the United States. Such protection shall be available only to such property situated in the United States (including the District of Columbia), Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

(c) The Corporation may insure or reinsure in whole or in part any company authorized to do insurance business in any State of the United States which will directly insure any person against loss of or damage to property resulting from any catastrophe of the type which may be determined by the President to be a major disaster for the purposes of such act of September 30, 1950, as amended, whenever in the opinion of the Corporation such insurance or reinsurance is required to protect property which it is authorized to protect, and such insurance or reinsurance cannot be obtained at reasonable rates or upon reasonable conditions from approved companies authorized to do insurance business in any State of the United States.

SEC. 5. The Corporation shall have the following general powers in carrying out the objects and purposes set forth in section 4 of this act—

(1) to have succession until June 30, 1964, unless sooner dissolved by act of Congress;

(2) to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(3) to adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws governing the conduct of its business, and the performance of the powers granted to it by law;

(4) to sue and be sued in its corporate name in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(5) to determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to the laws applicable specifically to Government corporations;

(6) to acquire, in any lawful manner, any property—real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible—to hold, maintain, use, and operate such property; and to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such property, whenever any of the foregoing transactions are deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized by this

act, and on such terms as may be prescribed by the Corporation;

(7) to execute all instruments necessary or appropriate in the exercise of any of its functions;

(8) to use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government;

(9) to settle and adjust claims held by it against other persons or parties and by other persons or parties against the Corporation;

(10) to appoint such officers, agents, attorneys, and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the Corporation; and to delegate to them such powers and to prescribe for them such duties as may be deemed appropriate by the Corporation; and,

(11) to take such actions as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the powers and duties herein or hereafter specifically granted to or imposed upon it.

SEC. 6. The Corporation, including its franchise, its capital, reserves, surplus, and income, shall be exempt from all taxation (which shall, for all purposes, be deemed to include sales, use, storage, and purchase taxes) imposed by the United States, or any Territory, dependency or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any real property (or buildings which are considered by the laws of any State to be personal property for taxation purposes) of the Corporation shall be subject to State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed.

SEC. 7. The Corporation shall be managed by a board of directors of the Corporation to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and to consist of five directors. The term of office of each member of the board of directors shall be five years except that the terms of office of the directors first taking office after the date of the enactment of this Act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, one at the end of one year, one at the end of two years, one at the end of three years, one at the end of four years, and one at the end of five years; and whenever a vacancy shall occur in the office of director other than by expiration of term, the person appointed to fill such vacancy shall hold office for the unexpired portion of the term of the director whose place he is selected to fill. Any director may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. Each director shall receive compensation at the rate of \$17,500. No director shall engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than that of serving as a member of the board of directors.

SEC. 8. (a) There is hereby created the "National Disaster Relief Fund" (referred to in this Act as the "Fund") which shall be used by the Corporation as a revolving fund in the performance of the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000,000 to be allocated to such Fund.

(b) Insurance premiums and any other revenues derived by the Corporation from its operations shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Fund, and all moneys in the Fund not needed by the Corporation for its current operations shall be invested in bonds or other obligations of the United States guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States.

SEC. 9. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act is amended by inserting

after "Tennessee Valley Authority;" the following: "National Disaster Relief Corporation."

H. R. 7945

A bill for the relief of sufferers in designated disaster areas for losses of real and personal property

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created a Federal Disaster Claims Commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, to be composed of the Director of Defense Mobilization, the Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, to direct and supervise, under such regulations as it may adopt, the payment of claims for losses of real and personal property suffered by individuals whose property is damaged in areas designated by the President as disaster areas; and local Federal disaster claim boards in each county in such designated disaster areas, to receive and process such claims.

SEC. 2. The said Commission shall have an Executive Director, who shall be selected by the Commission from an existing Federal agency, and whose duties shall be in addition to those presently exercised by him.

SEC. 3. The President is hereby authorized to request the Governors of States in which disaster areas exist to name a Federal disaster claims board in each county within the designated disaster area of their respective States, to consist of not more than 5 members, to be selected from each of the 2 major political parties, said board members to serve as a civic duty and without compensation.

SEC. 4. The Executive Director of the Commission is authorized to requisition from existing Federal agencies, on behalf of the Commission, and to assign such clerical staffs as may be deemed necessary for both the office of the Commission and of the board offices in the several counties.

SEC. 5. No claim shall be considered for a minimum of less than \$300, and the maximum allowable to any one claimant shall be \$5,000 for personal property and \$10,000 for real property; no claim shall be entertained from individuals found to be eligible for relief under any other provisions of existing law; and there shall be deducted from the total amount found to be allowable the amount of any cash relief benefits and/or insurance already received by the claimant from any agency, public or private, on account of actual loss suffered. All claims must be filed with the appropriate local county board within 6 months from the date of the designation of the area as a disaster area by the President.

SEC. 6. The local board in each county shall receive and process claims; shall, according to rules and regulations of the Commission, require the submission of proof of loss and of the actual value of property lost; and shall determine the fact and the extent of loss suffered. Upon a finding that a claim is allowable, the board shall certify the claim and the amount allowed to the Commission, which shall review the claim and thereupon make payment direct to the claimant.

SEC. 7. The right to claim shall vest only in the person who suffered the loss, or (1) the widow or widower, or (2), if there be no surviving widow or widower, then the surviving children.

SEC. 8. For the implementation of this act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of not more than \$100 million.

SEC. 9. (a) Any person found guilty of making a false or fraudulent claim, or assisting in the presentation of false or fraudulent claims, shall be deemed guilty of a felony and shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not to exceed \$10,000 or be imprisoned

not more than 3 years in a Federal penitentiary, or both.

(b) No part of any amount allowed under this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with claims hereunder, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating this provision shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

H. R. 7946

A bill for the relief of sufferers of casualty losses, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That section 23 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, title 26, United States Code, be amended by adding a new subparagraph numbered (D), to read as follows:

"(D) Casualty losses: All sums paid or incurred, not recoverable from insurance or otherwise, to restore property to its former condition of usefulness because of damage incurred by fire, storm, shipwreck, flood, or other casualty, or an equivalent amount if replaced with similar or like property of greater cost."

SEC. 2. Amend section 23 (e) of this title by rewriting subparagraph (3) to read as follows:

"(3) of property not connected with trade or business, if the loss arises from fires, storms, shipwreck, flood, or other casualty, or from theft, the deduction allowed under this section shall be the amount paid or incurred, not recoverable from insurance or otherwise, to restore the property to its former condition of usefulness, or an equivalent amount if replaced with similar or like property of greater cost. No loss shall be allowed as a deduction under this paragraph if at the time of the filing of the return such loss has been claimed as a deduction for estate tax purposes in the estate tax return."

SEC. 3. Amend section 122 (a) of this title to read as follows:

"(a) Definition of net operating loss: As used in this section, the term 'net operating loss' means the excess of the deductions allowed by this chapter and by section 23 (e) (3) over the gross income, with the exceptions, additions, and limitations as provided in subsection (d)."

H. R. 7947

A bill to provide that all gifts made to aid a disaster area shall be allowed as deductions for income tax purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions from gross income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(gg) Contributions for disaster relief: Contributions or gifts payment of which (1) is made within the taxable year to or for the use of any organization exempt from income tax under section 101 (6), and (2) is conditioned upon its use exclusively for charitable purposes within an area stricken by a catastrophe which has been declared by the President to be a major disaster within the meaning of the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes', approved September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U. S. C. secs. 1855-1855g). Amounts deductible under this subsection for any taxable year shall not be treated (except for purposes of section 120) as contributions or gifts to which subsection (o) or (q) applies."

SEC. 2. Section 23 (q) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions from gross income from charitable and other con-

tributions by corporations) is hereby amended by adding after "computed without the benefits of this subsection" the following: "or subsection (gg)."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this Act, but only in respect of contributions and gifts to be used for catastrophes occurring after December 31, 1952.

H. R. 7948

A bill authorizing the President to make permanent replacements of public facilities and public and private school buildings, damaged or destroyed in a major disaster, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (d) of section 3 of the act entitled "An Act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes," approved September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U. S. C. secs. 1855-1855g), is amended to read as follows:

"(d) by performing on public or private lands protective and other work essential to the preservation of life and property, clearing debris and wreckage on public or private lands, making emergency repairs to and temporary replacements of public facilities of local governments damaged or destroyed in such major disaster, making permanent repairs to and permanent replacement of public facilities of local governments, including public and private school buildings, damaged or destroyed in such major disaster, providing temporary housing and other emergency shelter for families who, as a result of such major disaster, require temporary housing or other emergency shelter, and making contributions to States and local governments for purposes stated in this subsection."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 8 of the act entitled "An act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes," approved September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U. S. C. secs. 1855-1855g), is amended by striking out "a sum or sums, not exceeding \$5 million in the aggregate," and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "such sums as may be necessary."

H. R. 7949

A bill to provide that the expense to an employer of repairing or rebuilding the home of an employee damaged or destroyed in a major disaster shall be considered a business expense for income-tax purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That section 23 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions for trade or business expenses) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(D) Expenditures for replacing employees' homes: Amounts paid or incurred by an employer for ordinary and necessary repairs to residential property damaged by a catastrophe, or the replacement of residential property destroyed by a catastrophe to the extent that such replacement property does not exceed in value the property so destroyed, but only if (i) such catastrophe is determined to be a major disaster by the President for the purposes of the act entitled 'An act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes,' approved September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U. S. C. secs. 1855-1855g), shall be considered as ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred in carrying on any trade or business, (ii) such amounts are paid or incurred within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, or the date on which the President determines that such catastrophe is a major disaster, whichever is later, (iii) prior to such catastrophe

such property was owned by, and used as the principal residence of, an employee of such employer, (iv) such property is to be owned and so used by such employee subsequent to such repairing or replacing, and (v) the policy followed by such employer in repairing or replacing his employees' property does not discriminate in favor of employees who are officers, shareholders, persons whose principal duties consist of supervising the work of other employees, or highly compensated employees."

SEC. 2. Section 22 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to exclusions from gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(17) Certain amounts received by employees: Amounts received by an employer which are treated as ordinary and necessary business expenses by reason of section 23 (a) (1) (D)."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment but only as to amounts paid or incurred after December 31, 1952.

H. R. 7950

A bill to appropriate funds for preliminary planning and for construction of necessary flood-control measures in Massachusetts

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for expenditure by the Chief of Engineers under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, for the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, and related projects authorized by law, and for detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects authorized by law, to remain available until expended:

CONSTRUCTION OF FLOOD-CONTROL MEASURES

In the Connecticut River Basin, \$300,000 for Barre Falls Dam.

In the Thames River Basin, \$100,000 for Buffumville Dam.

PLANNING OF FLOOD CONTROL AND LOCAL PROTECTION WORKS, SURVEYS AND RESURVEYS

In the Connecticut River Basin, \$50,000 for a resurvey of the Quabog River to Palmer, Mass.

In the Thames River Basin, \$140,000 for planning of Hodges Village Dam; \$140,000 for planning of East Brimfield Dam; \$100,000 for planning of Westville Dam.

In the Blackstone River Basin, \$60,000 for planning of the Worcester Diversion Tunnel; \$100,000 for planning of West Hill Dam; and \$60,000 for planning in the Blackstone River Basin.

In the Merrimac River Basin, \$50,000 for planning of local protection works at Fitchburg and Leominster, Mass., and for a new survey of the Nashua River; \$50,000 for planning of local protection works at North Andover and Lawrence, Mass., and for a new survey of the Merrimac and Shawsheen Rivers; \$50,000 for planning of local protection works at Haverhill, Mass., and for a new survey of the Merrimac and Little Rivers; and \$50,000 for planning of local protection works at Lowell, Mass., and for a new survey of the Merrimac River.

H. R. 7951

A bill to create a Federal Disaster Research Commission to offer adequate protection for the Nation against hurricanes, floods, tornadoes, and other meteorological disasters through an accelerated program of research and development

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created a Federal Disaster Research Commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, to be composed of the Chief of the United States Weather Bureau, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of Defense

Mobilization, the Administrator of Civil Defense, the Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, the president of the American Red Cross, the Chairman of the National Science Foundation and the president of the American Meteorological Society, to direct and supervise, under such regulations as it may adopt, a program of research to provide maximum possible protection for the Nation against hurricanes, floods, tornadoes, and other meteorological and natural disasters.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall institute an immediate program of basic research involving the determination of all the physical attributes of hurricanes and tornadoes, their behavior, development of scientific theories and their proof, and the collection and use of data already obtained by various Federal agencies.

(b) The Commission further shall institute a program of applied and development research to provide methods of forecasting, detection, and tracking of tornadoes and hurricanes.

(c) The Commission shall study the development and utilization of an effective, early warning system to function in the case of hurricanes, tornadoes, or any type of situation with disastrous possibilities. The Commission shall further study the feasibility of integrating such warning systems into existing national and civil defense warning networks to forecast approaching atomic air attack.

SEC. 3. The said Commission shall have an executive director, who shall be selected by the Commission. The Executive Director of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of \$20,000 per annum and shall be a recognized meteorological authority.

SEC. 4. The Executive Director of the Commission is authorized to requisition from existing Federal agencies, on behalf of the Commission, and to assign such professional and clerical staffs as may be deemed necessary and practicable.

SEC. 5. For the implementation of this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of not more than \$5 million.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR FLUSHING OF MINE VOIDS

MR. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

MR. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I introduced in the House on January 3 a bill authorizing the Federal Government to make grants to States to assist them in planning and carrying out State programs for the flushing of mine voids underlying residential and business areas to protect the public from detriment and danger to its health and safety. Such grants are to be made only on the basis of State plans submitted by the States and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior is to prescribe the matters which shall be required to be set forth in the plan of the respective State, including requirements for the expenditure of \$1 of the funds of the State for each dollar of Federal funds granted under this act.

The act is titled "To provide Federal assistance to States to augment their efforts to prevent surface damage resulting from mine cave-ins."

My bill does not provide any specific sum because of the fact that this is a national legislation and the sums vary from State to State, depending upon the requirements and conditions of the respective State. The immediate object of my bill, however, is to authorize the Federal Government to match the \$5 million provided in legislation of a like nature, which is currently in the Appropriations Committee of the Pennsylvania State House.

It is the considered judgment of the best mine authorities acquainted particularly with the circumstances of the anthracite fields that a program for the flushing of existing mine voids is the most practical and effective method of surface protection.

Obviously, such a program would of necessity be continued over a period of years, and will call for the expenditure of considerable sums of money by both the State and Federal Governments. I have not been able to obtain from the mining authorities either State or Federal, an exact projection of the number of years or the amount of dollars such a program will demand. It must be kept in mind, of course, that the initial target of such a project will be the flushing of existing mine voids. The problems of the surface subsidence in the hard coal area resulting from present and future mining must of necessity be considered in separate legislation. Naturally, this jurisdiction will rest almost exclusively under the authority of the Pennsylvania State Legislature since this is a matter of regulations of the mining industry within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. In this regard, I am preparing a bill to provide for the control of coal mine cave-ins to prevent damage to property and danger to the public health and safety.

Insofar as the Federal Government may have jurisdiction this bill will provide for surveys, investigations, and research relating to the causes and extent of coal mine cave-ins which cause damage to residential and business property overlying such mines and endanger the public health and safety.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

MR. LANHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 40 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

MR. BROWN of Georgia (at the request of Mr. LANHAM) asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

FLEXIBLE IMPORT QUOTAS

MR. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

MR. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill that would authorize

the use of flexible import quotas by the United States under carefully prescribed conditions laid down in the bill.

It may seem strange that legislation should be necessary to authorize action that under the Constitution is clearly among the enumerated powers of the Congress.

Unfortunately, under the trade agreements program the regulation of our foreign commerce has gravitated more and more into the hands of the executive branch of the Government, more particularly the Department of State.

So far has this exercise of power been taken from the hands of Congress that we now find ourselves in the position of having renounced the use of import quotas in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, known as GATT, negotiated by the State Department under a presumed delegation of power. Obviously, Congress cannot renounce its responsibility in this way and certainly the Department of State cannot deprive us in this roundabout or any other way of our legislative authority.

It is proposed even now that Congress ratify the OTC—Organization for Trade Cooperation—by approval of United States membership in that international trade body. This would put the approval by Congress on the surrender of its own constitutional authority and responsibility.

It is also necessary to point out that this proposed quota legislation has become essential for the proper protection of American industry and agriculture because the remedy against serious injury provided under the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act has been all but nullified by the Executive veto, on advice of the State Department. The record is clear. Less than 10 percent of the cases brought before the Tariff Commission have been afforded relief.

I should remind the Members of this body that such import quotas as we now have under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, such as those on wheat, wheat flour, raw cotton, peanuts, dairy products, and so forth, have been held by GATT to be in conflict with its general ban on quotas and do not fit its exceptions. These exceptions are tailor-made to fit other countries, not us.

While GATT has graciously waived action to obtain compliance from us we have promised to eliminate all existing quotas as soon as possible. Our agricultural quotas will be reviewed once a year by GATT as a reminder that we are pledged to eliminate them.

Congress, which has the duty of regulating our foreign commerce, is not consulted in these matters. Quotas on industrial products, such as textiles, glassware, tuna, bicycles, watches, and so forth, are outlawed so far as the United States is concerned, by GATT. The one exception is the escape clause. That route is too long and in any case, as I have already said, has been all but closed by Executive action.

The quota bill that I have introduced would reassert the power of Congress to legislate its will in this field of its undoubted authority.

The bill itself is moderate. Except where an unreasonably large share of the market had already fallen to imports, the volume of foreign sales here would not be cut back. Imports would be assured a fair share of the domestic market but domestic producers would be relieved by quotas of the fear and uncertainty that comes from untrammelled import competition, which as certainly ruins the market for imports themselves as for our own producers.

Flexibility is built into the proposed system by providing a percentage participation in the domestic market by imports and by other special provisions designed to prevent a freezing of a particular import pattern.

Finally the bill would accord more favorable treatment to imports from the higher-wage-standard areas of the world than to low-wage-standard areas and thus provide some incentive to raise such standards.

It is my firm conviction that the quotas authorized in the bill for establishment by the Tariff Commission after hearings afford a sounder and more effective protection of the domestic producer under many existing circumstances than the tariff and yet offer other countries a more liberal participation in our market.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes and include as part of my remarks an article that is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$240.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Friday to file a report on H. R. 7871.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that H. R. 7541 be laid on the table. A similar Senate bill has passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

OUR NATIONAL PARKS DESERVE INCREASED ATTENTION

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one item mentioned in the President's message which is of special interest to me is his reference to the need for more and better facilities in the National Park System, in view of the increasing interest of the people in the great outdoors. Action with respect to this matter is overdue. Citizens have voiced their concern over inadequate and obsolete facilities and increasingly crowded conditions in the parks, both through the press and by letters to their congressional representatives.

Everyone interested in the conservation and proper use of the Nation's assets in scenic and historic spots should be concerned. Those areas comprising the National Park System were the objective of 50 million visits last year. It is estimated that this will increase to 80 million visits within a decade. Healthful and proper use of leisure time is a national necessity. Our parks play a starring role in providing this.

I have learned that the National Park Service has had an intensive study made of the needs for adequate provision for this present and expected visitation, and of the related conservation measures to protect the areas unspoiled for the enjoyment and inspiration of future America. A program known as Mission 66 has resulted from that study. When it is submitted to the Congress it will certainly meet with wide acceptance throughout the entire country. I am glad to lend my full support to this program.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CHRISTOPHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 40 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was black Wednesday for the farmers of America.

For this was the day that Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson took steps to deliver the future and the fortunes of the farmers of America to the whims and the fates of Republican Party politics.

In a haze of deep secrecy he called only the Republican Congressmen of the House Agriculture Committee around

him to disrobe his farm program and expose it for scrutiny and appraisal of political expedience before he let the Democratic majority members of the committee, the farmers and all the people know what it was all about.

Mr. Speaker, we hear that the so-called farm program will see the light of day for the first time on next Monday, in a special message to this Congress.

I want to say here that I regret deeply, in view of the suffering of our farmers, that anything Mr. Benson submits must now appear here in the gaudy garb of partisan politics.

I want to say to my colleagues that the House Committee on Agriculture, of which I have the honor of membership, has sought strenuously to make the farmers' pressing problems the concern of the whole Nation and not merely a pawn in the fortunes of a political party.

Our chairman, Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, telegraphed Mr. Benson early last fall advising him that, because of the threatened disaster in agriculture, he was prepared to call the Committee on Agriculture into session immediately, although Congress then was in recess, to consider any suggestions the Secretary might have to stop a headlong collapse of farm prices. The reply our chairman received shocked all of us who have an interest in the farmers' welfare. He flippantly cast the suggestion aside and told our chairman he would have nothing until 1956.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all know that this so-called new program, conceived in secrecy and now being birthed in partisan politics—whatever form it takes, it will be Mr. Benson's unwanted child.

Mr. Benson wants little, if any, more than the flexible, or lowered, price-support mechanism to remedy the troubles of the farmers of America. Our committee was formally informed of this in February of 1955, although it was then evident that the flexible program was a complete failure and that it was actually pushing farmers to the brink of disaster. I want to quote to you from the hearings of our committee of February 18, 1955, in which I interrogated Mr. True Morse, who is Under Secretary and Mr. Benson's principal officer in the Department of Agriculture. This is from the record:

Mr. ABERNETHY. You stated a moment ago that you did not have any material recommendations to make now and you would not have during this Congress which materially change the basic price support law. That is the way I understood your answer.

Mr. MORSE. As of now.

Mr. ABERNETHY. As of now?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. In other words for the last 2 years or more you have been working on this problem, the freeing of agriculture, and 100 percent of parity at the marketplace. And so we can now assume, in view of his answers and the fact that you have nothing else, no recommendations to make, after more than 2 years, we can now assume that we now have a program which the administration feels is a program which frees agriculture and which gives them 100 percent of parity at the marketplace—we have it now?

Mr. MORSE. We have the program passed by the Congress, the 1954 act, and other legislation we recommended, and into which Congress injected its judgment, of course. As the President said in his state of the

Union message, "We are headed in the right direction now."

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will you answer this question: American farmers were promised by this administration that they would be "freed" and get 100 percent parity in the market place. Do we now have the program to get that? That certainly ought to be answered either "yes" or "no," and you might be able to say that we will get it later. If we haven't got it, when will we get it?

Mr. MORSE. The 1954 act (the act supplanting the firm 90-percent supports by flexible or lower supports), if allowed to go into effect and operate as we believe—

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will get it?

Mr. MORSE. Will largely accomplish that.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What do you intend to bring up then during this Congress after 2 years of study to free agriculture and give us 100 percent of parity at the market place?

Mr. MORSE. With the action which Congress took last year, except for refinements—as of now, we are not here with what you might term major legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, things have changed since February in 1955. Mr. Benson still sticks by the flexible sliding scale low-price farm program. It is discredited among the farmers of America but it is still Mr. Benson's chosen child. That which is now being put together, whatever it may be, is his also, but he does not want full responsibility for it. Thus, on yesterday, he had its political pulse tested, gave it a political burp and on Monday he will put it on the political doorsteps of Congress.

In all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, this will be a child of political expedience. The whole Nation must be aware of this. We deeply regret what we have seen. But I want to end here by pledging the farmers of America that if there is any merit in it our Committee on Agriculture will sift it out. I pray, however, we may find a better means of serving agriculture than through a program written to get votes for those who already, on notable occasions have disdained and condemned purposes and methods they are now about to advocate.

AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 84th Congress, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman, undertook the study of problems in many phases of the American merchant marine. Some of the matters into which we inquired were extremely complex and presented issues which will not easily be resolved. It will be our purpose in the present session, however, to delve deeper into these difficult situations with the hope that before this Congress adjourns some real evident progress will be made toward the establishment of a strong and vigorous merchant marine—the kind envisioned by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and the

only kind this historically maritime Nation of ours deserves.

But my remarks today are principally directed to one particular aspect of the merchant marine problem—that having to do with the 50-50 legislation. As you know, there was enacted by the 83d Congress Public Law 664, which provides, among other things, that at least 50 percent of all cargoes given away or sold for foreign currencies must be transported overseas on privately owned United States-flag vessels, provided such vessels are available at fair and reasonable rates. This was not new legislation, actually, since it merely enacted into permanent law provisions of similar nature which had theretofore appeared in numerous appropriation and mutual aid statutes and which had become recognized by the Congress as the national shipping policy of the United States Government.

Shortly after the opening of the 84th Congress certain press stories appeared alleging that the administration's program for selling farm surpluses abroad were—to quote them—"running into a bottleneck" because of the 50-50 law.

The specific charge was that a lack of American bottoms was delaying the shipments.

In view of the fact that Public Law 664 was reported to this body by the Merchant Marine Committee after careful and thorough consideration and particularly in view of the obligations imposed upon our committee by section 136 of the Legislation Reorganization Act of 1946, hearings were immediately called to inquire into the substance of these press stories and allegations and into all other phases of the administration of the law by the agencies concerned. Deficiencies of administration were found and pointed out in the committee's report, all with recommendations designed to improve operations under the statute. But one thing was abundantly clear—there was not developed one scintilla of evidence to support the charge that shipments abroad were being, or in fact could ever be, delayed or impeded by the lack of American-flag privately owned vessels. The law itself took care of that by authorizing shipments without regard to the 50-percent limitation whenever American-flag vessels were not available at fair and reasonable rates.

I believe this prompt and effective action by our committee has forever set to rest the particular line of allegations with which we dealt at that time. But, as anyone close to the merchant marine picture knows, the rumors and invectives have not stopped. The principal source seems to be certain foreign maritime nations who contend that they should have the right to carry in their own ships not 50 percent of these Government aid cargoes, but 100 percent. That position strikes me as utterly lacking in logic and so obviously prompted by greed and selfishness as not to warrant serious concern by any of us.

However, there is another source of contention with this law which does give me concern—and I might add—serious concern. I refer to certain agricultural groups and interest.

As you know, I represent a district in North Carolina where the welfare of a great majority of my constituents is integrally tied to farming. My friends and neighbors are farmers. In fact, one of my dearest friends here in Congress is the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, HAROLD D. COOLEY, who likewise represents a farming district of North Carolina.

Some of these people have been told that the program for the disposal of surplus farm products to the needy countries of the world can never be successful so long as the 50-50 law remains applicable to it. Now, while I am personally devoted to the principle that our country must have a strong merchant marine, both from the standpoint of national defense and from the standpoint of a sound industrial economy, I am likewise devoted both by heritage and by what I conceive to be the obligations of my office to the welfare of the American farmer. I do not intend to permit any legislation or administrative action over which I have the slightest degree of responsibility or control to stand in the way of the farming interests of this country.

I fully realize the great importance of the 50-50 legislation to the American merchant marine. But I wish to state here and now that within the next few weeks I intend to schedule hearings before the Merchant Marine Committee to which I will invite representatives of all groups involved with this problem. The purpose of these hearings will be to explore fully the overall effect of the 50-50 law and its administration upon the national economy with particular reference to the American farmer. I realize that some may hesitate to express opposition to the law before the Merchant Marine Committee, but I promise every witness a full and fair opportunity to present his views regardless of what they may be. I myself will be the first to propose some alternative method of assisting the American merchant marine if the facts warrant the conclusion that the provision of Public Law 664 are inimical to the interests of the American farmer and the American public.

DISASTER AND INDUSTRIAL RELIEF IN NEW ENGLAND

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as our beloved President's message was read, I am sure that every Member of the House felt as I did, that we shared a rejoicing that he has returned to health. His message was very fine and promises assistance for everyone—and, Mr. Speaker, we must make sure that his recommendations are carried out.

Mr. Speaker, since the President's illness, I believe that his recommendations insofar as help for disaster areas is con-

cerned and in the distribution of orders for our national defense have not been carried out. Our arsenals are being scrapped because they are being reduced to the point where there will be almost no production at all in a short time. Massachusetts has been discriminated against in arsenal production at Watertown and Springfield. Legislation passed by the Congress has been disregarded as contracts have been awarded to certain companies that might have been given to the arsenals and provided work for our highest skilled defense employees. If these skills are lost, it will be tragic for us in an emergency. That has proved desperately true in the past, I need not remind the House. I want to speak also of the humanitarian side of this problem—the suffering caused by the displacement of workers and their families, many of them of long standing and most highly skilled. Watertown production has not been equaled anywhere else, and its research work has been outstanding. I am supremely proud and grateful to have it in my congressional district.

There is another distressing matter that has come to my attention—the following letter from General Hauck speaks for itself. The Congress saw fit to appropriate funds to keep the Murphy General Hospital in operation for the benefit of the servicemen and women. Now, apparently, the War Department wants to close it. It must be prevented if possible. It is base ingratitude.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., January 4, 1956.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: This is to inform you of the Department of the Army's plans for the future utilization of Murphy Army Hospital at Waltham, Mass.

The Department of the Army plans to request that the Congress, early in this session, modify title III of the Appropriation Act of 1956 to permit the discontinuance of the operation of the Murphy Army Hospital and effect the utilization of the installation for other than medical purposes as outlined in the attached information sheet.

Your interest in this installation is appreciated and I trust this plan meets with your approval.

Sincerely,

C. J. HAUCK, Jr.,
Brigadier General,
GS Chief of Legislative Liaison.

[Enclosure.]

Murphy Army Hospital is now being operated in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 157, 84th Congress which requires the operation of the installation during fiscal year 1956. In addition, the Department of the Air Force is utilizing 50,000 square feet of space at the installation as offices for approximately 300 contractor personnel engaged in electronic research activities.

In response to the request contained in the Senate Committee Appropriations Report No. 545, the Department of the Army has restudied the requirements for Murphy Army Hospital. This study has determined that the Army, Navy, Air Force, the Veterans' Administration, and the Public Health Service do not have a requirement for the installation as a medical facility.

The Department of the Army does have a requirement for approximately half of the installation for use as the offices of the New

England Division, Corps of Engineers, which are now located at 857 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Mass. The space now occupied by the New England Division is under a General Services Administration lease which expires on March 23, 1956. The owner of the property, Boston University, has informed the General Services Administration that the university requires the property for its own use and will not renew the lease. The Murphy Army Hospital contains a gross usable area of 270,000 square feet and can accommodate the New England Division which requires approximately 135,000 square feet of space. The Department of the Air Force will have a requirement for an additional 85,000 square feet of space commencing on or about June 1, 1956, and continuing for approximately a 2-year period to support an electronic training program.

The Department of the Army considers that the proposal outlined above will fully utilize the facilities at the Murphy Army Hospital and also will be of some economic benefit to the local civilian community in that the proposed utilization would involve approximately 1,400 military and civilian personnel compared to approximately 680 personnel now at the hospital.

TAX RELIEF AT HOME OR TAX RELIEF ABROAD

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, tax relief at home or tax relief abroad is the choice facing this Congress today. It is not—as many of our leaders would have us believe—a choice between a balanced budget and tax relief. A balanced budget has already been achieved. A balanced budget was assured when we revised the Federal Tax Code to provide a favorable tax climate for American business and American industry so they might grow and expand. As a result of the expansion and growth that has already taken place, we now have achieved the greatest national productive capacity, the greatest number of jobs available, the greatest amount of take-home pay for American workers, and the most productive tax base that this Nation has ever experienced. Not even during wartime have we reached the peak of prosperity we now enjoy. As a result of all this the Federal Treasury collected almost \$2 billion more than our budget makers anticipated at the beginning of this year. So a balanced budget has already been achieved.

On the other hand, during the past 7 years the Congress has given away in foreign aid of one kind or another a little more than \$40 billion, and Uncle Sam has gone in the red during those 7 years some \$40 billion, almost exactly the same amount that we have given away in foreign aid. If it had not been for our foreign-aid program we would have had a balanced budget every year during the past 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, today most European countries have balanced budgets. England, France, and Western Germany have balanced budgets. Today our European neighbors produce more goods of

every kind than they ever produced in prewar days. They do this largely because of the rebuilt factories and the modern American machinery we have furnished them at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Today Europe also has a \$14 billion favorable balance of trade, a greater dollar balance to buy American goods with than Europe has ever had at any one time in her entire history. The Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, under questioning before the Ways and Means Committee, acknowledged this fact. Yet we continue to pour out foreign aid—American taxpayers' dollars—to further bolster the economy of European nations. Every dollar of foreign aid we provide, whether economic aid or military aid, is a dollar less for the European taxpayer to pay. Is it not about time for the European taxpayer to stand upon his own feet and provide for his own needs? Is it not about time for this Congress to think more about the American taxpayer and less about the foreign taxpayer? Is this foreign-aid program to be like Tennyson's brook, "to run on forever"?

Mr. Speaker, American foreign aid today is being used to balance European budgets and to reduce European national debts; while Uncle Sam's budget has been kept unbalanced, and Uncle Sam's debt has kept on increasing. Does this make sense? Foreign aid today is a failure and a fraud. It should be cut off entirely. Today we have \$10 billion appropriated for foreign aid, most of which is unspent and unobligated. This amount will provide for 2 more years of foreign aid. Why appropriate \$1 more for such a program? It is time to give our American taxpayers a break.

TAX RELIEF

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues confronting the 84th Congress at this time is the question of tax relief for the American taxpayer.

One school of thought proposes that tax cuts be deferred until we have achieved a balanced budget.

Another group suggests that we cut the cost of Government operation and pass on the savings to the taxpayers.

Still another group would want to reduce the national debt before we cut taxes. I am sure that these groups are sincere in their proposals and have the best interests of the people of this country at heart.

But why can we not accomplish all three objectives—why can we not balance our budget—start liquidating our national debt—and at the same time give tax relief to our people?

For the past 3 years I have urged this Congress to set up a national lottery which would conservatively bring in \$10 billion a year in revenue. This added revenue can well accomplish our goal—a tax cut for all, a balanced budget, and

a part payment in reducing our national debt.

The New York Daily News, in an editorial in the issue of Monday, January 2, 1956, supports my position. I hope and trust that every Member of Congress will take time to read it and realize that hypocrisy is cheating our people and Government of a tremendous revenue.

The said editorial follows:

How ADVANCED ARE WE?

Most Americans pride themselves on being citizens of the world's most advanced nation—more automobiles, telephones, and television sets than any other country has, more soap and detergents used per person per year, higher literacy percentages, religious and cultural activities flourishing, and all the rest of it.

Far be it from us to snoot any of these achievements and signs of progress, or to deny that the United States is the greatest, finest, and most livable country in today's world.

However, there is at least one field in which we are a backward people, and a hidebound people.

The United Press the other day took a look around the civilized world, and came up with the following findings:

On the sunny side of the Iron Curtain, the great majority of governments either operate or permit lotteries, allow gambling in virtually all forms, and get millions yearly from taxes on these activities.

About 10 million Britons each week sink small sums in the football pools. A few citizens win; but the British Government always wins, to the tune of about \$47 million a year in taxes on the pools.

Of government lotteries, Ireland's Hospital Sweepstakes is the best known. But it is far from the only one. France, Denmark, Japan, Sweden, and even our organized dependency of Puerto Rico have them. Gambling is permitted and fairly taxed in the Philippines, Holland, Hong Kong, Austria, and Switzerland. In Italy, you can buy a chance to win a top prize of \$320,000 in a football pool.

When the UP's reportorial spotlight swung around to the United States it lit up two facts which, when you put them together, spell hardship with a capital H for the American taxpayer.

LOT OF BETTING; LITTLE REVENUE

Fact 1: The American people by and large are the most enthusiastic and open-handed bettors in the world. Most of them will bet on virtually anything. For example, the total parimutuel turnover at United States racetracks in 1955 was \$2,066,302,588, while harness racing accounted for an additional \$476,728,009.

Fact 2: With the exception of horse racing, dog racing, and bingo games in some States, the American fondness for gambling is not hooked into the revenue-raising systems of government (save in Nevada, which is wide open as regards gambling). On the huge 1955 track turnover mentioned above, governments got only \$178,015,822. Of this, the Federal Government got not a red cent.

How big is the total gambling turnover per year in this country? Well an authority on gambling in all forms has estimated the turnover at approximately \$30 billion, or more than we spend on education, religion, medicine or automobiles.

This authority is Representative PAUL A. FINO, Republican, New York, who for some years has been trying to induce Congress to set up a national lottery.

PAINLESS TAXATION

Such a lottery would be operated by the Government, under rules designed, and by citizens picked with a view to keeping rack-

eteers from moving in on it. Tickets would be cheap, drawings frequent, prizes numerous; and the Government would take an appropriate cut from the proceeds.

How much revenue would be raised is a matter for educated guessing. Mr. FINO's guess, based on his education in other countries' gambling revenues and the annual gambling turnover in the United States, is that an American lottery could conservatively be expected to get up \$10 billion a year in revenue, after prizes and overhead.

Such a lottery would have other virtues. It would in effect be painless taxation, with the revenues taking the place of some of the extremely painful taxes all of us now pay. It should freeze a lot of criminals out of the gambling industry, just as repeal of prohibition froze a lot of rascals out of the liquor business. And it should keep at home the estimated \$4 to \$6 billion a year which now goes into foreign lotteries.

Really, isn't it about time for the United States to get progressive in this matter of making gambling yield the revenues it should? Isn't it time for us to catch up with Britain, Ireland, Japan, France, and Puerto Rico?

PRESIDENT ENDORSES PRINCIPLES OF THE SOIL BANK OF FERTILITY

Mr. CARL H. ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, relative to the soil bank of fertility.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the references made by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in his message today to the need for a soil bank program has brought new hope to the 22 million people living on our farms throughout the land. As the Congress takes action on this recommendation, and I have every confidence that it will approve the basic principles of the proposal, it will in my judgment do much for the benefit of American agriculture and our rural business communities. The enactment of authority for a soil bank of fertility program will provide the means for our farmers, in concert with their Government, to bring supplies and market demands into a reasonable balance and at the same time conserve our most precious asset—the soil itself—and pass on to future generations a better land than they found.

If I had learned nothing else in almost 18 years as a Member of the House, I have learned this day that faith in an idea and perseverance in its advancement can eventually produce the desired results if the cause is just and the legislative proposal is sound in principle. Today, the acceptance by the President of my proposal is very gratifying to me.

A brief recitation of the history of the Andersen soil bank of fertility idea may well be worth the time of some of our newer colleagues, as it offers the best reason I know why a Member of Congress should stay with an idea he believes in, despite the seemingly insurmountable obstacles in its way.

I stood virtually alone just a few years ago in the advocacy of what I termed a "soil bank of fertility," and now we see

it endorsed in principle by the great farm organizations, thousands of farmers, our distinguished colleagues on both sides of the Capitol, and now today by the President of the United States.

For many years it had seemed obvious to me that the most significant need in agriculture was a way or a means to keep production on our 5 million farms in reasonable balance with market demands. If our farmers were to receive a fair return for their investments, labor, and technological know-how, they must somehow be protected from the merciless fluctuations of a market over which they exercise no control.

American industry has long followed the practice of maintaining careful balances between supply and demand for manufactured goods. If a factory finds its supply lines choking up with consumer goods, it simply closes down an assembly line or even a whole plant until the balance is restored. But it is one thing to close down an assembly line for a few days, and another to close down a field of corn, a litter of pigs, or a part of a dairy. Farming is on an annual basis at the very least.

After several years of patient but sometimes discouraging effort to gain acceptance of what I termed in the beginning a soil bank of fertility, I finally saw a quickening of interest just this past year on the part of farm organizations, conservationists, sportsmen, and others interested in American agriculture and conservation of our soil and water resources. After a statement last fall that he had "an open mind on the subject," I sent the following letter to Secretary of Agriculture Benson on September 17, 1955:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., September 17, 1955.
Hon. EZRA BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For a number of years it has seemed obvious to me that a program of price supports and acreage allotments would not by itself meet entirely the farm-price problems facing us in American agriculture since the close of World War II.

I have consistently maintained the conviction that price supports on basic, storable commodities should be held at 90 percent of parity. I have also consistently agreed that surpluses of some commodities would undoubtedly result from either firm or flexible supports. As a matter of fact, I have often said that reducing the support level would result in greater rather than lesser surpluses. Farmers are simply forced to produce more at lower prices so as to meet uncontrolled living and operating expenses. Recent experience has confirmed this and many former advocates of your program of flexible price supports now admit that fact.

I have not been persuaded by advocates of flexible price supports to believe that reducing farm prices would effect comparable price reductions at the consumer level and thus act as a stimulant to consumption. Again, recent experience has confirmed my judgment. Although farm prices have fallen to 84 percent of parity, we have seen no appreciable reduction in prices of foods to consumers. From this we are led to the conclusion that reducing farm prices to any level, even to a level representing disastrous ruination for many farmers, would not

necessarily benefit consumers nor reduce surpluses.

In recognition of the direct relationship between production and conservation, and the impact each has upon the other, I have in recent years advanced the proposal that certain acreages now in production of commodities surplus to our domestic and foreign market needs be diverted to what I have termed a "bank of fertility." My general premise advanced then was that if our agricultural plant produced more than needed we should temporarily, and on a voluntary basis, retire into a "bank of fertility" these unneeded acres. It is my thought that by the application of conservation practices to land so diverted we would at the same time meet a vital need for greater conservation of soil and water resources. My proposal thus helps to solve two basic problems facing agriculture.

Since you have been Secretary of Agriculture, I have discussed this plan with you on at least two occasions. On January 28, 1954, when you appeared before my committee in connection with your request for appropriations, I outlined this plan to you. May I recall the following excerpt taken from my comments, pages 23-24 of the official report of those hearings: "Let us take the unnecessary acres out of production if we produce too much, but let us not, on the other hand, do anything that will destroy the prices of what we produce. * * * What is wrong with cutting down production and giving an incentive to the farmers to keep the acres out of production, and at the same time placing these acres into soil-conserving banks, so to speak? * * * Why not, instead of paying storage charges on something we do not need, prevent the production of this surplus and beyond everything else, make our soil more valuable for the future?"

Having also discussed this plan with many farmers, farm leaders, other Members of Congress, etc., and received a favorable response, on February 2, 1954, I introduced H. R. 7663 to authorize such a program. The 83d Congress having taken no action on my bill, it was reintroduced in the 84th Congress (H. R. 2370). It is now before the House Committee on Agriculture and the same basic principles contained in that bill are the subject of this letter to you today.

The members of that committee are familiar with the principles of my plan. On May 10, 1955, I appeared before that committee to outline, in some detail, what I had proposed. My testimony said, in part: "I propose that the Government lease from the farmers of our Nation on a voluntary basis approximately 30 million acres of land for such time as it is necessary to meet this problem. I propose, Mr. Chairman, that this land under lease be placed in a soil-fertility bank, and estimate that in order to achieve the required reduction in farm acreage, it will be necessary to pay the individual farmer approximately \$10 on an average per acre per year for the rent of his land. By not producing wheat, corn, and cotton we do not need, and by making that 30 million acres of farm land more valuable to future generations, the price-support program, in my opinion, would not be a burden."

Although in the beginning I stood virtually alone in advancing the basic principles of the bank of fertility, this past year I have gained the interest and support of Members of Congress, farm organizations, conservationists, farmers and sportsmen. Although different groups and individuals have developed their own plans or proposals on this subject, I am happy to note that while they understandably differ in some details, they all embody the fundamental principles of my plan; and that is to retire unneeded acreage into a bank of fertility.

In the best interests not only of American agriculture but of all of our people I urgently request your careful reconsideration

of my plan with the thought in mind that it be incorporated in the over-all farm program at the earliest possible date.

Unless the severe decline in farm prices is reversed and the accumulation of unneeded commodities reduced, we are faced with serious consequences not only in our farm economy but, in my judgment, in the national economy. Your announcement of the acceptance of the basic principles of this plan as a cornerstone for your announced attack upon the economic ills of agriculture would, in my opinion, bring great hope and encouragement to the farm community. I firmly believe the enactment of legislation to divert unneeded acreage on a voluntary basis from production to conservation will do more than anything else now proposed to solve the problems immediately before us. You will remember that I have suggested that an average rental of at least \$10 per acre, based upon the local lease rates, would on a voluntary basis bring millions of acres of cropland into the bank of fertility. The overall cost would scarcely equal the storage charges of today.

I understand that this proposal will be considered by your Agricultural Advisory Committee at its forthcoming meeting. I hope that you will acquaint them with my position as well as the growing tide of support for this plan. Moreover, I hope that you will wholeheartedly support my plan in its basic principles.

American farmers are of one voice in their demand for a more proportionate share of our booming economy. They may differ individually and collectively as to the detailed means of accomplishing this, but please make no mistake about it—they know that they are on the bottom rung of the economic ladder and they insist on moving up. This, I am sure we are agreed, they cannot accomplish by themselves under the present program.

Your statement of yesterday that you have an open mind on this bank of fertility proposal has encouraged me to write you this letter. As this subject is a matter of national interest, I am making this letter public.

Sincerely,

H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member of Congress.

In recent months, there has been a rising tide of popular support for the soil bank idea, culminating in the President's message today.

It is not, or should not be, necessary for me to remind anyone of the difficulties our farmers are facing in a falling commodity price market. It is generally agreed that their present problem of high production costs and low commodity prices may be attributed primarily to two things over which they had no control. First, the tremendous and patriotic productive effort of our farmers in World War II and the Korean conflict created a temporary margin of production above consumption which has piled up some stocks and depressed the markets. Second, our otherwise booming national economy has resulted in the labor, equipment, and other production costs going up at the same time gross farm return has gone down. The resulting price-cost squeeze has hurt our farm economy and has hurt our farm people.

Net farm income has dropped one-third since 1948, while total national income has risen 50 percent. Farm mortgage debt has increased 60 percent in that short time, and farmers have seen their share of the total national income decline from 9.4 percent in 1948 to less than 5 percent today.

Now I do not believe that any one has intended that this happen to 22 million of our people simply because they live on farms. On the contrary, I believe that my colleagues from the big cities are just as concerned—maybe not as directly, but in equal measure—as I am about these conditions in our agricultural economy.

No section of our country, no political party or economic group, and no individual to my knowledge has by deliberate or purposeful intent set about to depress farm commodity prices. We in the farm communities are glad to see the rest of the economy booming, but we want our fair share of that prosperity and we believe you want us to have it.

No one can successfully claim that any political party or political leadership is responsible for this, because the decline in farm income has persisted under 2 different administrations of the 2 great political parties, 11 parity points from 1948 through 1952, and now an additional 14 points to date.

It is not fair and it is not honest to blame any one administration or any one program such as the 90 percent of parity price supports for these conditions, for it has been a combination of many things which brought about the decline in farm commodity prices.

I would be the first to say that not everything has been done in recent years which, in my judgment, would have reversed this trend. I could honestly and confidently say that if the 83d Congress had approved my bill proposing the authorization of a soil bank of fertility, or even if the 1st session of the 84th had acted on it, we might well be working our way out of it by now. The enactment of flexible price supports was a grave mistake.

But I think the time has come for us to set aside our differences of opinion, political arguments, and other minor considerations, in the best interests of American agriculture and the national good.

The people we represent grow impatient in times of stress and demand action by their Government to relieve them of adversity which they cannot by themselves overcome. Action to reverse this downward trend in farm prices is long overdue, but I am encouraged today to believe that this session of Congress will write the necessary farm legislation to accomplish this reversal.

The President, in his message, has recognized one of the basic ills of agriculture and has proposed a remedy for which I have long campaigned. Although the Andersen soil bank idea the President has endorsed does not by itself offer the entire solution to this price-squeeze problem, it will in my judgment, make a major contribution when accompanied by the other necessary programs to bolster prices, expand markets, and bring about the distribution of surplus stocks to needy and deserving people.

Speaking personally and also in behalf of the people of the Seventh District of Minnesota which I have the honor to represent, may I say that we are deeply grateful to the President for the forth-

right manner in which he has brought the basic principles of the Andersen soil bank of fertility before the Congress for action.

CAMBRIDGE, OHIO: ALL-AMERICA CITY

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, Cambridge, in the 15th District of Ohio, has recently received recognition as an All-America City. This designation has been given it by Look magazine and the National Municipal League. It is an award which is richly merited and the honor has come to my home city because of the valiant efforts of civic leaders and organizations of residents to make it the city which it now is.

At one time Cambridge was a prosperous community, depending upon coal mines, steel mills, pottery and glass industry, for its prosperity. In the twenties, the coal resources became submarginal through depletion of the most accessible stores. The steel mills were moved to other areas and consolidated with others in keeping with the trend of the times. The wave of importations of products from low-wage countries cut heavily into glass and pottery industries. The depression which all America sustained, was even more intensely felt in Cambridge. People began moving away to seek employment elsewhere, and the mines, factories, and houses stood idle. Cambridge was on the skids.

There were men with determination and with ideas who felt sincerely that the city could come back. It would be impossible for me to name them all, for the idea once initiated was seized by many who worked individually and collectively to attract industry, to restore faith, and to rebuild a city which a changing America had made a ghost city. Today, many new plants are in operation, are expanding and are offering employment to the people of Cambridge. Radio Corporation of America, the Vanadium Corporation of America, Champion Spark Plug, Hoffman-La-Roche, Hoover Co., and many other industries have found a home there. The Cambridge Glass Co. was reorganized and many of the employees purchased shares in the company in order to keep it going and to keep alive the name, Cambridge glass.

Indeed, this recognition of All-America City for Cambridge, Ohio, is justly deserved, and the city and its leaders in government, industry, labor, education, and religion, as well as all of the residents who have played an important part in its growth, are to be congratulated.

The Cambridge story is being told throughout America, and it serves as an inspiration for other communities which fell out of step with the times.

An editorial in the Marietta (Ohio) Times tells the story as follows:

CAMBRIDGE EARNS HONOR

Cambridge, our neighbor city, has won high honor and national recognition by being named an all-America city by the National Municipal League. Its distinction is no gift, but was earned the hard way by its citizens and their leaders in a 20-year battle to restore industry to a municipality that was in danger of becoming a "ghost town." It is rather a reward for united and persistent effort that has brought results.

Depression began in Cambridge and Guernsey County in the 1930's with the closing of coal mines and steel mills. A promotion fund was raised by subscription among community leaders, businessmen, and displaced employees. The money was used to take over abandoned buildings and rebuild or remodel them. The structures were then sold to industries at bargain insurance rates and on easy terms. This brought in a number of new concerns that employed local labor.

Another blow fell in 1954 when the Cambridge Glass Co. was forced to discontinue operation because of financial trouble. Businessmen and employees rallied again and bought \$250,000 worth of stock. The plant was improved and modernized and work was resumed in it last spring. The company is now showing a profit.

Ten other cities are included on the all-America list for successful municipal endeavor to improve their condition. Three are cited for suppressing gangsterism, corruption, and machine rule, by which they had been ridden. Three others are given recognition for initiating modernization of rundown and obsolete city facilities; 2 for long-range programs for providing for the needs of their growing populations; 1 each for solving pressing school problems and for providing for proper sewage disposal.

Cambridge has good reason for being proud and happy over the distinction that the city has been given. It has been successful in the highly competitive field of increasing and retaining industry, largely through the initiative and consistent effort of its citizens.

The Cambridge Daily Jeffersonian contained an editorial by way of acknowledgment of the honor:

CAMBRIDGE SHINES

Cambridge's impressive story of industrial recovery, tagged Operation Bootstrap, has won for the community the All-America City award and national recognition.

It is the greatest honor ever to come to Cambridge, an honor that a community could receive only by showing noteworthy accomplishments through alert, continuing citizen participation. Our story was studied carefully by the jury in charge of selecting the winners of the awards, which are co-sponsored by the National Municipal League and Look magazine.

This community's long battle against becoming a ghost town because of the shutdown of coal mines and steel mills here is familiar to most of us. The manner in which the people of the community tackled the problem and licked it has given Cambridge the reputation of being a community of unusually resourceful and courageous people. Faced with a crisis the people of Cambridge through cooperative effort lifted themselves out of the doldrum—Operation Bootstrap.

Since then the community has faced other knotty problems. The story tells of the crisis last year when the Cambridge Glass Co. ran into financial difficulties. Again, the problem was licked.

Operation Bootstrap is designed to assure ourselves of greater security and contentment. It leads to things we consider most

essential to a more abundant American way of life.

The widespread favorable publicity that goes with receiving the award will prove advantageous to the community for many years to come. The city should and will celebrate, but in celebrating may we rededicate ourselves to the ever-growing tasks ahead.

We are proud of our accomplishments. By continuing to be generous in our contributions of time, effort and money we will be able to maintain the lofty position reserved only for an All-America community.

COMMUNIST DOUBLECROSS IN KOREA

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article with certain revisions requested by our military personnel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. O. K. Armstrong, a former Member of this body, recently made a firsthand study of how the Communists are doublecrossing us and our allies in Korea. He has set forth his findings in an article of outstanding and lasting interest in this current issue of the Reader's Digest, entitled "The Communist Doublecross in Korea."

This article gives specific examples of how the Red Chinese and North Koreans, under their Soviet masters, and with the assistance of their stooges—the Poles and Czechs on the so-called Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission, have persistently violated the terms of the Korean armistice.

I wish to commend Maj. Gen. Harlan C. Parks, who was our chief of the U. N. Military Armistice Commission at the time of Mr. Armstrong's visit to Panmunjom, and other United States and allied officers, for their startling revelations of the danger we face in Korea. I include this article—with certain revisions requested by our military personnel—in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE COMMUNIST DOUBLECROSS IN KOREA

(By O. K. Armstrong)

On the night of July 27, 1953, the day the Korean armistice was signed, United States military forces detected by radar the track of planes entering North Korea from Manchuria and landing on the two airfields still usable.

"Enemy aircraft—jet propelled—numbers undetermined," the radar operators reported.

The Communist forces had no MIG planes in Korea when the fighting stopped. Under the armistice terms both the United Nations and the Communist commands agreed not to build up military strength.

U. N. officials were alarmed. If the Reds were breaking their word on the very day they gave it, what would they do in the future?

Two and a half years have given the answer: The leaders of Communist China and North Korea, backed by their Soviet masters, have proved that they never had any intention of observing the solemn agreement that brought an end to the fighting. While the U. N. forces in South Korea have strictly observed every item of the truce, the Red aggressors have constantly violated it.

"We face danger here," said Maj. Gen. Harlan C. Parks, senior U. N. representative on the Military Armistice Commission, as we sat in his headquarters near Panmunjom recently. "The Reds have persistently broken the truce in order to build up their combat forces, particularly their air force, whereas the military strength of the U. N. command, by virtue of scrupulous compliance with the armistice terms, has steadily declined in combat capability."

Spokesmen for the free world contemplating some agreement with Communist leaders for mutual inspection of military strength with a view to control of armaments should study what has happened in Korea. In the language of the Reds, inspection means a chance to observe unhindered everything in enemy territory while preventing any effective observation in their own.

Stripped to its fundamentals, the truce provided that neither side would increase its military strength. Military personnel could be rotated, man for man, and weapons could be replaced, item for item; but no additional strength could be brought in. Ten ports of entry, five for each area, were designated, through which all rotation and replacement would have to pass.

To enforce the truce, inspections were to be made by a Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission, made up of representatives of 2 countries named by the United Nations and 2 by the Communist side. The U. N. side named Sweden and Switzerland, both genuine neutrals. The Reds nominated Poland and Czechoslovakia, both as Red as Soviet control can make them and about as neutral as Premier Bulganin.

American military men in Korea put up a howl. They predicted that the inspection teams would not be allowed to see anything in the Communist area; even if they did, the two Red stooge members could veto any move toward corrective measures. But the armistice was a political decision; the warnings of the military men were ignored.

The U. N. side immediately set up a system of reporting and control, to insure that all incoming and outgoing personnel and materiel were shipped only through the designated ports. Complete, accurate, daily reports have been issued ever since.

Not one item of military equipment has come into South Korea that has not been duly entered upon the daily reports prepared for the inspection teams and given into the eager hands of the Reds. Every military person leaving or entering is carefully cataloged. At first all reports were made in triplicate. Soon the Reds demanded that they be made in quadruplicate. "One copy for Moscow," our military clerks say.

Meanwhile, the Communists have never set up a regular reporting system. They turned in no reports whatever until September 12, 1953, and then listed only 964 departures and zero arrivals for the one day preceding. Their first combat-materiel report was submitted October 6, listing an outgoing shipment of four antitank guns with 20 rounds of ammunition. It was not until February 9, 1954, that the Red joint command made another materiel report, showing an incoming shipment: one anti-aircraft gun. All this time, of course, masses of Red Chinese troops were being rotated, and huge quantities of weapons and equipment were being brought into North Korea.

By every conceivable device, the Communists nullify the provisions for inspection of armaments. On last April 26, mobile team No. 6 attempted to inspect Uji and Namsi airfields. The Swedish and Swiss members reported: "The team was not permitted to see the cockpits of any MIG aircraft; neither was the team permitted to note the serial numbers of the inspected aircraft. We were not in a position to ascertain whether any aircraft had been shown us more than once;

it was impossible to see all the aircraft on the same day because the Polish and Czech members started long discussions, saying that they did not wish to check all the aircraft."

The Reds never permit the inspection teams to interrogate a person unless he has been coached on what to say. At Taechon on last March 10, the Swiss and Swedish members of team No. 7 picked a guard at random and asked that he be sent in for questioning. The North Korean liaison officer violently objected.

"But surely he could tell us from his own observation what he had seen here," persisted the neutral spokesman.

"Oh, no," was the reply. "He is a sick man. In fact, he is insane. He could tell you nothing." The Polish and Czech team members declared the soldier was indeed insane and must not be talked to.

One of the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission members, an outstanding authority on international law who told me he was serving at the request of his government, gave me other examples of Red doubledealing.

"My team was given information that a large consignment of MIG's had reached a certain airfield in North Korea—entirely in violation of the truce, of course," he related. "We insisted that this field must be inspected. As usual, the Poles and Czechs declared there was nothing at the airfield. Our information, they said—they always say—was a rumor started by the warmongering Americans."

"We persisted, and finally got agreement to inspect the field—after a week for preparation. The team took off in a North Korean plane, which landed at the wrong airfield. 'Engine trouble,' said the Reds. So we lingered there for 2 days, while they tinkered with the engine. Next day we came out to leave; no pilot. He had been taken suddenly ill, they said. Another day's delay. When we got to the airfield, there was nothing there. 'Just as we told you,' said the Czechs and the Poles."

A Swiss inspection team member detailed how the Reds got around—literally—the use of prescribed ports of entry. He told how an associate stood with an inspection team in North Korea on a bridge across the Yalu. Beyond the bend in the river, less than 2 miles away, the Reds had constructed another bridge. Members of the inspection team could hear the rumble of a train crossing over it. But when the Swedish and Swiss inspectors insisted upon going to have a look, the Czech member consulted his papers and solemnly announced: "It says in my book there is no bridge there." And that ended the matter.

On February 23, 1954, Gen. Paul Wacker, then the senior Swiss member, declared in a report to the Commission: "In the South the teams control all materiel being brought into Korea, a control which is being carried out, thanks to the documents submitted by the local authorities, load manifests, ship manifests, as well as by inspections on the spot. In contrast, we find that in the North not more than 2 to 4 inspections of spare parts of war materiel have been carried out each month, and these only in 2 ports of entry."

On February 27, 1954, Capt. Lee Wan Bong, of the Chinese People's Volunteer Army, an interpreter for the North Korean delegates to the Military Armistice Commission, walked over to the U. N. side and stayed there. He confirmed what our intelligence already knew, that the activities of the Polish and Czech members of the inspection teams are directed by Soviet Russian officers. Lee gave the names of the Russian major general and other high-ranking officers in charge. He also brought proof that Russians frequently dress in Polish and Czech uniforms and take

their places on the inspection teams for first-hand observation of United States military installations in South Korea, getting information down to our last jeep.

On last February 5, a United States four-engine craft, flying over the open sea west of North Korea, was attacked by eight MIGs. United States Sabre jets moved in and gave battle. Two of the Red planes went down in flames and the others streaked back to their bases. The North Korean general on the Military Armistice Commission made a great show of protest at the next conference.

"Where were those planes based?" he was asked by the U. N. chief.

"They were planes from our side, peacefully based in the Korean People's Republic," said the general.

"Have you ever reported the importation of these MIGs?" demanded the U. N. spokesman. For once the Red leader was non-plused. He realized the admission was on record. But after a pause he shouted: "Your side tries to confuse the matter."

Every day brings to the desk of the Military Armistice Commission fresh evidence of Communist doublecrossing. One day a detail of Republic of Korea soldiers was dispatched to salvage a plane that had fallen in the demilitarized zone, an operation permitted under the armistice rules. Each was armed with a United States 45-caliber pistol and a carbine—weapons authorized for personnel performing such duties. Chinese Communist soldiers suddenly opened fire. Two of the ROK Army sergeants were shot in the back and instantly killed.

"I immediately sent an officer to make an on-the-spot investigation," related Parks. "Based upon the preliminary report, he called for a joint investigation with Communist representatives at the scene of the incident. When the joint team met the following morning, the bodies of the sergeants had been dragged across the military demarcation line into Communist territory. Rocks had been piled around the bodies. In the hand of each was his pistol—with empty chamber.

"In fabricating their evidence the Communists made one glaring mistake. They put the slides in the empty pistols in the forward position with the hammer cocked. Anyone familiar with the operation of that United States pistol knows that when the last round is fired the slide is automatically locked in a rearward position."

When Parks faced his Communist counterpart at the conference table at Panmunjom the Red general claimed that his soldiers had fired in self-defense. Parks retorted that it was a case of plain cold-blooded murder, and proved his point with indisputable evidence.

From Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission sources, and from United States and ROK officers, I heard ample evidence that the Communists could now move against the United Nations with overwhelming force. One of the best sources of information was Maj. Gen. Kim Chang-Yong, chief of ROK military counterintelligence.

General Kim dresses his agents as coolies or businessmen as occasion requires, and they form a tight network of observation all over North Korea. Accurate information also comes from Korean and Chinese defectors and from Communist spies arrested in South Korea.

Evidence from such sources establishes the following facts. At the time of the armistice, the Reds had 12 airfields. All had been pounded by U. N. bombers, and only two were usable. Today, they have 39 airfields, most of them capable of handling jets, all built under Soviet supervision.

At the signing of the armistice only a handful of Red planes and their mechanics—but no MIGs—were based in North Korea. Today there are 20,650 men in the combined air forces of North Korea and the Chinese "volunteers." According to General Kim's

figures, they have 630 planes, of which 350 are MIG jets.

As for ground forces, there were approximately 1,200,000 troops in North Korea when the truce began. Many of the Chinese were "volunteered" down to Indochina to fight the French, but these were replaced to maintain about a constant strength. General Kim's figures show the Reds have reorganized into 17 corps of 46 divisions, with 596,756 North Koreans and 545,368 Chinese. In addition, three divisions of Russian troops are stationed at Pyongan, a division of Soviet Mongol troops is based at Jangjon, a battalion of Russian Air Force is based at Sinihju and a company of Russian engineers has headquarters at Musan.

More significant than manpower is the heavy increase in firepower. "All equipment, except for certain light parts assembled in Manchuria, is made in Russia," declares General Kim.

In contrast to this, the U. N. ground-force strength has deteriorated since the armistice. Its firepower remains about the same, which means it is not now nearly equal to that of the Reds. Its weapons cannot be replaced by improved equipment, as has been the case in the North. The ROK Air Force has the exact number of planes it had on July 27, 1953: 140, of which 5 are F-86 jet fighters.

There is no doubt that we face danger in Korea. The Red military power now holds a double threat. They can start shooting. Or they can negotiate from superior strength in some future conference, demanding that we sign on the dotted line—or else.

As one high-ranking United States commander of troops on the bleak armistice line expressed it: "From where I sit, one thing is certain: the enemy is still the enemy."

LITTLEVILLE (MASS.) RESERVOIR

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I know that you, with every Member of this Congress, sympathizes with the thousands of people in New England, and much of the Northeast, who suffered so severely during the two disastrous floods in August and October of last year.

The results of these floods were thoroughly and conscientiously studied by the members of the New England delegation in Congress and recommendations were developed which either have been or will be submitted for consideration. I am certain that all Members of Congress will want to do everything within their power both to provide means of preventing any recurrence if that is humanly possible, and of furnishing adequate relief if any such disaster occurs again.

Portions of the First District of Massachusetts were among those areas which suffered extensively heavy damage. The Federal Government at the direction of the President, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the county and local governments as well as the American Red Cross and many other agencies and groups made magnificent contributions toward the relief of the suffering and the repair of the extensive damage. But it seemed obvious to me that remedial legislation to cover the possibility of any

future disaster should be promptly considered at this session of Congress and I am confident that the whole subject matter will receive the earliest possible consideration by the congressional committees concerned and by Congress as a whole.

One of the most immediate and useful projects which can be considered is the matter of an adequate flood-control system for the New England area. This has been the subject of study by the Corps of Engineers and the results will be presented as soon as possible.

In the meantime, we do have the advantage of a comprehensive report after a survey of the New England-New York region. This was undertaken under the Flood Control Act of 1950—Public Law No. 516, 81st Congress. It consists of some 46 volumes, was completed by the New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee and submitted under date of March 15, 1955. Among other recommendations, it proposes a comprehensive plan for the Connecticut River Basin consisting of local protection works and the construction of 21 additional flood control reservoirs to supplement the five such reservoirs already completed and in operation.

One of these proposed reservoirs is known as the Littleville Reservoir and would be located on the Westfield River which is a tributary of the Connecticut River.

Communities, utilities, and individuals in both Massachusetts and Connecticut in the region affected by the flow of water from the Westfield River suffered substantial damage as a result of the floods of August and October 1955.

At my request, the New England Division of the United States Corps of Engineers furnished me with its estimate of the reduction of damages during these floods if the Littleville project had been constructed and in operation at that time.

Their report to me is as follows:

August 1955, along Westfield River in Massachusetts.....	\$2,500,000
October 1955, along Westfield River at Westfield, Mass.....	115,000
Total.....	2,615,000
August 1955, along Connecticut River below entrance of Westfield River, in Massachusetts...	1,735,000
October 1955, along Connecticut River below entrance of Westfield River, in Massachusetts...	50,000
Total.....	1,785,000
August 1955, along Connecticut River in Connecticut.....	3,265,000
October 1955, along Connecticut River in Connecticut.....	415,000
Total.....	3,680,000

Or, a total estimated reduction—

In Massachusetts.....	\$4,400,000
In Connecticut.....	3,680,000
Total.....	8,080,000

I have been advised that the estimated cost of this project at the 1955 price level is \$5,500,000.

When these two factors of a cost of \$5,500,000 and an estimated loss of \$8,080,000 in these floods alone are

weighed, the urgency of this project is apparent beyond any question.

A considerable amount of other pertinent data is available and will be presented to the proper congressional committees in connection with the consideration of this project.

At this time, I have introduced a bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the preparation of plans in order to construct this Littleville Reservoir. I believe that the basic facts which I am now submitting amply justify favorable action by the congressional committees and by Congress at the earliest possible date during this session.

I am glad to add that my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], portions of whose district would be clearly benefited by the construction of this reservoir, plans to introduce, subsequently, a similar resolution and that he has supported effectively every effort to provide this realistic means of immediate relief to western Massachusetts. I have also appreciated the generous and wholehearted support extended by the officers of the State and local governments in both Massachusetts and Connecticut.

I urge immediate consideration of this resolution as a practical, reasonable, and constructive action on the part of Congress, fully merited upon all the facts which have been developed.

I am now including a copy of this resolution:

H. R. 8132

A bill authorizing the preparation of detailed plans for the Littleville Reservoir on the Middle Branch of the Westfield River in Massachusetts

Be it enacted, etc., That the appropriation of funds for the preparation of detailed plans for the Littleville Dam and Reservoir on the Middle Branch of the Westfield River in Massachusetts, is hereby authorized; Provided, that the work shall be carried out substantially in accordance with the plan set forth in the report of the New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee, dated March 15, 1955, and on file in the Office of the Chief of Engineers; Provided further, that in the preparation of the detailed plans hereby authorized, the Chief of Engineers is authorized and directed to make such modifications as he may deem warranted as a result of the hurricane floods of 1955.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined with my colleague from Massachusetts, Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON, in sponsoring a companion resolution authorizing the construction of the Littleville Dam and Reservoir on the Middle Branch of the Westfield River in Massachusetts. These resolutions are based on a survey conducted by the New England-New York Interagency Committee. In its report of March 15, 1955, the committee recommended the construction of the Littleville Reservoir and stated that the project was an essential to further protect from the devastating effects of floods the populous area through which the Westfield River runs. If this reservoir had been in being prior to the disastrous floods of last August and October, a reduction of damages would have resulted of some \$2,500,000 along the Westfield River and \$5 million along the Connecticut River. The studies made in connection with the NENYIAC report

clearly indicate the economic justification for this project. Both Congressman HESELTON and I earnestly desire that the Committee on Public Works take early action on our resolutions and favorably report authorization for construction. If authorization is approved, it is our hope that some planning money be provided for fiscal 1957.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Thursday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

SEGREGATION

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the address of the President has in it many laudable things, but there is one item to which I would like to refer briefly now and more in detail on next Thursday under my special order to address the House for one hour.

I am referring to President Eisenhower's recommendation that we here in Congress establish a bipartisan commission to examine the allegations that Negro citizens are being deprived of their right to vote and meeting with economic pressures. This is sheer buck-passing. The executive branch of the Government including the Department of Justice and the FBI now have the power to do this and the inescapable duty of so performing that which the law charges them with.

We here in Congress have our responsibility too. We must in this Democratic-controlled body press with vigor for more civil rights for the American people.

I repeat, the Department of Justice and the FBI now can investigate and should be investigating any depriving of any citizens of due process of law and the right to vote.

Otherwise, I think President Eisenhower's statement is a Republican challenge to a Democratic Congress which up to now has done absolutely nothing in the field of civil rights.

THE LATE DANIEL J. TOBIN, 1872-1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Daniel J. Tobin, one of the truly great leaders of the American labor movement, died on November 14, 1955, at the age of 83 years.

His life was an illustrious example of the contributions that immigrants make to our country. He came to Boston as a lad of 14 from his native Ireland and joined the Teamsters Union a few years thereafter. His great ability and devotion to his fellow workers was rapidly recognized, and in 1907 he was elected president of his union, a position which he filled for a period of 45 years. In 1952 he resigned from active leadership of the Teamsters Union and was elected president emeritus, a position he held at his death.

When Daniel Tobin became president of the Teamsters Union, its membership was limited to some 30,000 pioneers fighting for labor's rights. In many cases membership in the union meant prosecution and even loss of job. Under Tobin's leadership the membership of the union multiplied fortyfold, and the rights of union members to collective bargaining—despite Taft-Hartley and some objectionable laws enacted by several States after the passage of the Federal law—are protected. This enables unions to improve the economic conditions of their members under the ever rising standards of living made possible by our free enterprise system.

Possibly the best way to illustrate the benefits of unionism and the contributions that Daniel Tobin made to the members of his union is to compare the wages of teamsters in 1904, when Tobin held his last teamster job, and 1952 when he resigned from leadership of his union. During the latter year a teamster was making in 1 hour what Daniel Tobin made in a whole day 50 years earlier, and he had to work 10 hours, and more, to make that much without any fringe benefits such as paid holidays and vacations as well as hospitalization, medical care, and pensions.

Daniel Tobin was conscious of his public responsibilities as a citizen and labor leader. He took active part in politics and he was an admirer of our great Presidents, Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt. He led the labor division of the Democratic National Party during the four Roosevelt campaigns. During the war he was drafted to act for the President on important missions.

Daniel Tobin was an active fighter against totalitarianism and took a leading position in combating communism in the United States. He advocated union responsibility and was proud of his union's record of industrial peace during the two World and Korean Wars. As president of the teamsters, he insisted that all locals adhere scrupulously to their contracts with employers.

He was opposed to the split in labor's ranks and as president of the largest A. F. of L. affiliate and vice president of the A. F. of L., was active in trying to bring the two great labor federations together. His early efforts almost materialized before his death.

I personally will miss him as a good friend and neighbor. I admired him greatly, and I valued his friendship. With other millions of Americans I mourn the passing of Daniel J. Tobin, a great American and an outstanding leader in the struggle for a better America.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest men in the history of our times, one of the great immortals of all time by reason of his life, his achievements, and his contributions not only to the establishment of the progress of America but also to the constructive progress of mankind everywhere is Benjamin Franklin.

January 17, 1956, will be the occasion of the 250th anniversary of his birth. On that day and in the few days preceding January 17 appropriate commemorative exercises will be held in both Boston, Mass., and Philadelphia, Pa., in connection with the 250th anniversary of the birth of this great man.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 199) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas January 17, 1956, marks the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin in Boston, Mass. and

Whereas Benjamin Franklin, because of his dedication to the welfare of human society and the influence which he has exerted upon our material and spiritual development through his great and varied achievements as a statesman, diplomat, journalist, scientist, and philosopher, is universally recognized as one of the truly monumental figures of mankind; and

Whereas the contributions of Benjamin Franklin to the achievement of independence for the United States of America, to the formulation of our Constitution and the formation of the Government under which we live, and to our progress as a Nation over the years are unsurpassed by any individual in our history; and

Whereas Federal, State, and local officials of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, respectively, will join with the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce and the Franklin Foundation in commemorative ceremonies to be held in Boston in connection with such anniversary and also with The Franklin Institute of Philadelphia and cooperating organizations and the University of Pennsylvania to be held in Philadelphia; and

Whereas it is fitting that the Congress, as a mark of recognition and respect on behalf of all of the people of the United States, add its voice to the voices of those who are participating in these ceremonies: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress extends its greetings and felicitations to all those who are participating in the commemorative ceremonies being held in Boston, Mass., and in Philadelphia, Pa., on the occasion of the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin. The Congress joins with them and with all the people of the United States in expressing its appreciation of the great and indispensable part which Benjamin Franklin played, through his great and varied accomplishments in many fields, in the founding of our Nation and the establishment of a sound basis for the progress and development which our Nation has enjoyed over the years.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I shall not object, I wish to associate myself with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts in the advocacy of this resolution. Franklin was deeply associated with part

of my district. When a little town was trying to establish a library Ben Franklin was good enough to give them the books that made the effort successful. As a result the folks named their town after him. Franklin is a growing town in the county of Norfolk. This town gave to the country that great statesman, that great educator, Horace Mann, who really founded the public-school system.

I know they are delighted that the man who contributed so much to their welfare is to be honored.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE ALICE CAMPBELL GOOD

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, with deep regret I learned last night of the death of Alice Campbell Good, one of Brooklyn's outstanding citizens. Mrs. Good was the daughter of Felix Campbell, a Member of Congress from New York, from 1883 to 1891. At the time of her death, Mrs. Good was the Democratic national committeewoman from New York State, in which capacity she served since 1936. Since 1933 she had been a member of the State Electoral College. Other posts in which she served were the New York State Reconstruction Commission, the New York State Roosevelt Memorial Commission, and the New York City Board of Higher Education. She held membership in the New York City Charter Commission, the Brooklyn Unemployment Relief Commission and the Brooklyn Women's Committee for the New York World's Fair. Mrs. Good founded the St. John's College Auxiliary and she was an active worker in the Girl Scouts, Army Relief, British War Relief, and many other civic and philanthropic organizations. She was on the board of directors of the Brooklyn Chapter of the American Red Cross, and was a trustee of the Brooklyn Museum and the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences. She belonged to the Cosmopolitan and Women's City Clubs.

For her outstanding contributions to the religious and civic affairs of Brooklyn, Mrs. Good was the recipient of many awards and honors. Among them were the medal pro ecclesia et pontifice bestowed by Pope Pius XII; the gold medal of the Downtown Brooklyn Association, and the medal of the Women's International Exposition.

Alice Campbell Good was indeed an excellent example of unselfish devotion to our community, State and Nation. Her many accomplishments in the interest of Brooklyn are a lasting tribute to her generous character and loyal spirit.

To her daughter, Mrs. Gerard S. Smith, and to her son, F. Campbell Good, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, all of Brooklyn has been saddened by the death of Mrs. William H. Good, Democratic national committeewoman from Brooklyn and a leader in the political and civic life of the community. The daughter of Felix Campbell, who represented Brooklyn in the Congress early in the century, she served as a national committeewoman from New York State since 1936 and had been a member of the State Electoral College since 1933. During all of her life she was active in the charitable and civic organizations of her community and in 1945 was awarded the gold medal of the Downtown Brooklyn Association for her civic work. In 1952 she won the medal of the Women's International Exposition and 2 years ago was awarded a medal by Pope Pius XII. Mrs. Good was a lovely, gracious lady and many will remember her best for the dignity with which she presided at the historic election eve rallies which have been held for so many years at the Brooklyn Academy of Music. A devoted and loyal spirit has left us and will be greatly missed by all who were privileged to know this gallant lady.

SUMMARY OF FTC ANTITRUST COMPLAINTS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for almost 3 years now the country has been bombarded with propaganda about what a wonderful and vigorous job the Federal Trade Commission has been doing to enforce the antitrust laws. We have been told that under the present administration, the FTC has been reorganized and revitalized and has been doing its job with such wondrous vigor and efficiency as could hardly have been dreamed of under the previous Democratic administration. By way of proof for these claims, we have been offered numbers. Thus the number of suits started—or the number of new complaints charging law violation—has been compared with the number of complaints issued under the previous administration to prove that antitrust enforcement under the present administration is bigger and better than ever before. What this boils down to is a bigger and better "numbers game" than we ever had before.

	33 months under Republicans	33 months under Democrats
Number of complaints.....	59	56
Number of companies charged.....	60	66
Average assets of companies charged.....	\$32, 500, 000	\$256, 200, 000

It has been obvious to any thoughtful victim of this propaganda that mere numbers of complaints issued is in no way a guide to either the quantity or the

quality of antitrust enforcement. Your Small Business Committee has, however, surveyed the antitrust complaints issued by FTC over the past 5½ years, and we have some facts which I think will interest the Members.

In collecting these facts we looked into a charge that the Small Business Committee frequently hears, which is that since the FTC was reorganized by Mr. Howrey, that the guardian of the public interest has trained its antitrust guns on small business.

The antitrust law which the Federal Trade Commission is charged with enforcing is the Clayton Antitrust Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act. This act deals with monopolistic mergers, with monopolistic price discriminations and with foreclosure of markets through exclusive dealing contracts and tie-in sales agreements.

Here then are the facts: In the last 33 months—since Mr. Howrey was appointed to the chairmanship of the Federal Trade Commission on April 1, 1953, up until December 31, 1955—the FTC issued 59 new complaints charging violations of the Clayton Antitrust Act. In the 33 months immediately preceding, while the Federal Trade Commission was under the chairmanship of Senator Mead, a distinguished colleague of ours, the Federal Trade Commission issued 56 complaints charging violations of the Clayton Act. In other words, the new Commission issued three more complaints than the old Commission, in the same number of months.

In some instances a single complaint charged more than one company with violating the Clayton Act. In the past 33 months the FTC charged 60 companies with violating that act. In the previous 33 months under Senator Mead, the FTC charged 66 companies with violating that act. So there you have your numbers game. If the number of companies charged with violating the antitrust law were any index either as to quantity or quality of antitrust enforcement, then we could say that in 33 months under Chairman Mead, the FTC performed 10 percent more antitrust enforcement than it has performed in the 33 months just passed. But, of course, mere numbers of companies charged with violating the law do not mean any such thing.

But I come now to a comparison which does mean something.

During the 33 months under Senator Mead, the companies charged by the FTC with violating the Clayton Act were, on the average, approximately eight times as big as the companies charged with such law violations during the 33 months since the FTC was reorganized by Mr. Howrey. The average assets of the companies charged in Senator Mead's period were \$256.2 million. This average for the past 33 months has dropped to \$32.5 million.

In short, the antitrust weapon which Congress put in the hands of the FTC was used during the previous administration to hunt monopoly elephants, but during the present administration, it has been used to hunt monopoly rabbits.

I do not suggest that small business should be immune from antitrust prose-

cutions. On the other hand, we cannot avoid the observation that the acts and practices dealt with under the Clayton Act are not, for the most part, illegal per se. The effects of these acts and practices, and the substantiality of these effects, are the tests of illegality plainly specified in the law. We would normally expect, therefore, that the bad practices of a giant corporation have a clearer and more substantial impact upon the competitive system, and upon the public interest, than have the same practices engaged in by a small firm.

If this suggests different treatment under the law, it is because the great and the small have different effects upon the public interest. Indeed, the acts and practices dealt with in the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, would not be matters of public concern under a more competitive structure of business; and in point of historical fact, legislation on these acts and practices became necessary only after, and only because, a number of industries came to be dominated by monopolistic or quasi-monopolistic firms. Yet the giant corporations occupying these dominant positions are those which appear to have become immune to antitrust prosecutions by the new Federal Trade Commission, in its search for smaller game.

The smallest company charged with violating the Clayton Act during the entire 5½-year period is a tiny company whose total assets are only \$16,000. This company was made the subject of a complaint during the chairmanship of Mr. Howrey, which complaint charges that company with antitrust law violation in connection with the sale of citrus fruits. The company in question has reported to your Small Business Committee that its total income from the sale of citrus fruits in the year 1954 was only \$460.

I know nothing of the merits of the suit against this tiny company, and I do not mean to prejudge the issue. I do have great difficulty, however, in reconciling the fact that while this tiny company is charged with violating the Robinson-Patman Act there have been at the same time hundreds and hundreds of complaints from small-business men about the price discrimination engaged in by several multi-billion-dollar corporations, and the Federal Trade Commission has been utterly unable to see any violation of the Robinson-Patman Act in these discriminations.

I also have great difficulty in reconciling the FTC's complaint against this tiny company when at the same time, the FTC has watched the ballooning of the greatest wave of corporate mergers and consolidations in history, without hardly batting an eye. According to FTC's own reports there had been, at the end of last year, some 522 mergers by corporations having individual assets in excess of \$50 million. In all of the thousands of corporate mergers and consolidations which have taken place since the new antimerger law was passed, the FTC has issued only five complaints, and has not as yet actually stopped or unscrambled a single merger.

This is a serious matter. It cuts much deeper than the simple issue of false and misleading propaganda. When the Federal Trade Commission was reorganized by the Hoover Commission Reorganization Plan, its independence and bipartisan nature was destroyed and its antitrust enforcement brought under control of the White House. The result is that while the Federal Trade Commission hunts small game, thousands of small businesses are being squeezed out and destroyed by the monopolistic practices of certain big businesses, and these the FTC refuses to prosecute.

I hope that Congress will act during this session to return the Federal Trade Commission to the status of a bipartisan Commission, and as an arm of Congress.

INTERFERENCE OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN ADMINISTRATION OF STATE CRIMINAL LAWS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, during the 9 years that I have had the privilege of serving in this House I think I have established a reputation for moderation. After the recent Supreme Court decision on segregation I did not abuse that Court although I knew the decision was unsound and that it was based upon the sociological thinking of the members of that Court instead of upon the law and the Constitution. But, as I say, I did not abuse the Court for that decision. Frankly, I believed that the less said the better, so that our local school officials could go steadily on their ways maintaining the present segregated schools. Raving and ranting served only to stir the NAACP and other such groups to take action in the courts.

It is true that decision was purely an assumption of the legislative authority of the Congress. At a later date I shall have something to say about that because that is one of the dangerous trends of our time. In that decision the Court decided not what the law is, for they overturned a decision that had been standing for 75 years, but they decided the law as they thought it ought to be. As that great old judge of the circuit court of appeals, Samuel Sibley, now retired, wrote me recently, "that is legislation by whomever it is done and by whatever court."

However, I do not rise today to say anything about that decision. I rise to speak about an even more serious situation than that brought about by the decision referred to, which was wholly uncalled for, wholly without precedent to sustain it, and has wrought havoc for the colored people as well as the white people of the South. I want to call your attention to another matter, even more serious in its implications.

Mr. Speaker, in October 1953, Amos Reece, a Negro felon serving in the Georgia penitentiary on two counts of assault with intent to rape and on two counts of robbery, was assigned to the Cobb County public works camp. While

assigned to the duty of operating a road patrol or scrape, he went to the home of a young mother and housewife. He appealed to her for a glass of water and when she opened the door to hand him the glass, he grabbed her, dragged her into the living room and raped her in the presence of her young baby. Later he voluntarily confessed to the crime. The court appointed two able lawyers to represent him and he was given a fair trial. The jury found him guilty without recommendation and he was sentenced to death by electrocution.

After his conviction and after the court-appointed attorneys had entered an appeal, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People retained Dan Duke, an attorney of Atlanta, Ga., who had represented them in other matters, to take over the appeal. Thereupon, the local counsel were dismissed. The Georgia Supreme Court in a decision reported in Two Hundred and Tenth Georgia Reports, page 578, reversed the trial court on a technical slip in charging on the question of insanity. The court in reversing the case, however, stated "the evidence was amply sufficient to authorize the verdict."

On June 22, 1954, the defendant was again tried, this time represented by the same Dan Duke. Reece again was found guilty without recommendation and the conviction was affirmed by the Supreme Court of Georgia in a decision reported in Two Hundred and Eleventh Georgia Reports, page 339.

The Supreme Court of the United States granted a writ of certiorari and reversed the Georgia Supreme Court in its affirmance of the conviction upon the ground that the judge of the Cobb superior court had not appointed counsel for the accused until after he had been indicted by the grand jury. It was suggested in the decision also that he might have been denied a fair trial in the absence of proof that there were Negroes on the panel which tried him.

I bring this matter to the attention of the Congress not because the United States Supreme Court reversed the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia on such flimsy grounds although any lawyer will readily see that to require a court to appoint counsel for all who may be indicted by a grand jury before such indictment is found is an absurd requirement. In no State of the Union, I believe, is there any such requirement. Until an indictment is found, there is no need for counsel since neither the person accused of the crime nor his attorney can appear before the grand jury. What I am bringing to your attention is the wholly unwarranted action of the Department of Justice in requesting the Federal Bureau of Investigation to make an investigation of the administration of the criminal laws by the duly elected and qualified officials of the State of Georgia. One Warren Olney III, acting under directions from Herbert Brownell, the Attorney General of the United States, directed that such an investigation be made without citing any authority for such investigation. The same was wholly unwarranted and a flagrant invasion of the right of a sovereign State to enforce its own criminal

laws. The representatives of the FBI stated that they were to investigate the matter of the selection of jurors used by the officials of the Superior Court of Cobb County, Ga. The clerk of the superior court, the jury commissioners, and the solicitor general readily cooperated because they had nothing to hide in this respect but all of them deeply resented the unwarranted interference with the discharge of their duties by the Attorney General, Mr. Brownell, the third Olney, and representatives of the FBI though the latter, of course, were only discharging their duties as directed by Olney and Brownell. Incidentally, reporters for the Atlanta Constitution, one of the South's oldest and most reliable newspapers have reported that both the third Olney and Brownell refused to discuss the matter with them or say under what authority they were proceeding.

But the investigators went far beyond their inquiry as to how jurors were selected and whether or not there were Negroes on the list from which grand jurors and petit jurors were drawn. In an apparent effort to intimidate, they inquired of the solicitor general, the Honorable Luther Hames, Jr., an able, conscientious, fairminded and courageous public servant, whether or not he intended to again prosecute Amos Reece. There seemed to be a veiled suggestion in this question that it would be wiser if the solicitor general did not prosecute again. The judge of the superior court of Cobb County, the Honorable Jim Manning, a kindly, intelligent, and courageous man, refused to discuss the case with the nosy investigators because, as he stated to them, he feared he would be disqualified in any subsequent trial of the Negro, Reece.

Under the Georgia law relative to the selection of jurors, the names in the jury box are selected from the county tax lists and no discrimination is made in such selection because of race or previous condition of servitude. The solicitor general pointed out that 2 Negroes had served on the grand jury for October 1955, that 1 was called for service at the December term and at his request moved up for service on the February 1956 grand jury. The solicitor general pointed out also that 4 Negroes at the December term had served on the petit jury and that each of them was empaneled in cases tried at that term and that 1 jury had 3 Negroes on it. He explained also that on one occasion a Negro had been chosen as foreman of a petit jury.

The solicitor general who prosecuted Reece has pointed out that there are serious implications in the investigation. He says:

1. It can be used as a threat of prosecution in a civil-liberties action against local court officials.
2. That it came at a time when the local court was preparing further action in the case and was apparently initiated at a time when it was felt the court might be embarrassed in some manner by the investigation and deterred from taking further action in the case.
3. That they may attempt to use the information obtained as a matter of defense when the case is retried.

4. That there has been no race hatred or violence threatened at any time during the previous trial as the serious and dastardly nature of the crime was recognized by everybody in the community.

5. That it is a most serious violation of the right of the State to proceed in its own courts to punish criminal offenses against its own laws.

6. That this unwarranted interference is in the nature of a gestapo proceeding and that the police state operated out of Washington by political-minded officials is already in existence and freedom of action on the part of State officials is gone.

I rise today to express my indignation and to protest this unwarranted action on the part of the Attorney General acting through this man, Olney the Third, and the FBI. How deeply into politics is the Attorney General willing to drag the FBI, which has until Mr. Brownell became Attorney General been operated in a manner to win the approval of all the law-abiding citizens of America? It was not long after the present Attorney General took over that he began to prostitute the Federal Bureau of Investigation to political ends. I was distressed when the Director of the FBI, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, bowed his neck to his political master, the Attorney General, and testified in the matter of Harry Dexter White, a man long dead, for the sole purpose of trying to besmirch the character of an ex-President of the United States and to make it appear that that great American and courageous man who had served in the United States Army with distinction was soft on Communists. Had Mr. Hoover had the courage to defy the edict of the Attorney General that he testify in this case, he would have stood in no danger of losing his job because his action in trying to maintain the high standards and political impartiality of his organization would have won such universal approval that Mr. Brownell would not have dared discharge him. Having bowed to the dictates of the Attorney General and having permitted his organization to be dragged into this political investigation, he has inevitably lowered the standing of the one organization that has stood between the people of the United States and the Communist conspiracy. If he continues to permit this organization to be used for political ends as is the case in the present investigation in Cobb County, he will inevitably destroy this great organization. The Attorney General must take a major portion of the blame for this prostitution and weakening of the organization which has, in the past, enjoyed the highest confidence of the people of America. But this confidence and respect cannot be expected to continue if the organization is to be used for political purposes and to try to garner the vote of the NAACP and its followers by interfering with the courts of a sovereign State in the administration of justice.

There are other serious implications and I warn the NAACP now and those who do its bidding, that if it continues its frantic and insane efforts to wipe out all racial lines in the South in the hope of seeing the blood of the two races mingled in a mongrel race, it will see the blood of the two races mixed, but not in

future generations, but rather in the gutters and streams of our land.

Your speaker has never been a member of the Ku Klux Klan; and the law-abiding and right-thinking citizens of my State and the Southland as a whole, have condemned such organizations and have succeeded in driving them out of existence and in putting an end to lynchings in the South. But if those who pose as the friend of the Negroes continue to try to interfere with the orderly process of the courts of the State in their efforts to protect the women of the South from the beasts who attack them, the white men of the South and even the good Negroes in the South will respond in a manner that will be surprising to the NAACP. If we cannot protect through the courts, because of interference by the Federal Government, our southern womanhood from the rapists, and if we cannot protect our citizens from the comparatively few Negro criminals, I will join with all the good people of my State and the Southland in finding a way to protect them. Again this is not a threat but a warning. The State of Georgia does not intend to submit passively to interference on the part of the Federal Government with the administration of its criminal laws. And those of you who are not from the South had best take warning that if it can happen to us in the South, it can happen to you, if a politically minded Department of Justice thinks it will promote its political welfare.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the State of Georgia's system of courts and its administration of justice. There has never been any real challenge to its fairness. I have been a solicitor general for 6 years myself. I was a prosecuting attorney when I was elected to this House. I know that the rights of the colored race are protected.

I have seen juries take the evidence of a Negro against a white man. I have seen them find a white man guilty of assault upon a Negro.

I heard one old colored man tell most graphically about how a white man had plunged a knife into him, and he described how that thing was twisted in his chest. The white man thought he had killed him and left him for dead. The jury convicted that white man, as it should have done.

In Georgia the rights of the defendant are really protected. Of course the defendant has two strikes for every one the prosecuting attorney has in striking a jury. In addition, he can make an unsworn statement on the stand and cannot be cross-examined, and the judge has to charge the jury that they may believe that unsworn statement in preference to the sworn testimony.

I, on one occasion, saw a colored man on trial for shooting at another. He was just as guilty as could be, but he made such an appeal to the jury, making a much better speech to the jury than his lawyer made, that they acquitted him. They took his unsworn statement because they were intrigued by his humor and his ability to express himself.

So, as I say, I am proud of the record of the State of Georgia in its administration of justice.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Like my colleague from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] and also my colleague from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER], before being elected to the House of Representatives of the United States I served as a solicitor general of the State of Georgia. In fact 8 of the 10 Members of the House of Representatives from Georgia have served either as superior court judge, superior court solicitor general or as a member of the bar and as an officer of the courts of Georgia. I commend my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] for bringing the attention of this body to the unwarranted and unprecedented action by the United States Department of Justice, which he has so well and so ably referred to in his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I support the position which has just been taken by my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM]. The Justice Department of the United States, by and at the direction of the Attorney General, Mr. Brownell, and an Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Olney, has brought about an action, referred to in detail by my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM], which is a direct invasion of the sovereignty of the State of Georgia and which is an affront and an insult to our system of jurisprudence, and a personal insult to the distinguished judge—Hon. James T. Manning—and solicitor general—Hon. Luther C. Hames, Jr.—of the superior court of Cobb County, Ga., both of whom I know well and for whom I have the very highest admiration and regard.

Recently, the Supreme Court of Georgia in the case of *Amos Reece v. The State* (211 Ga. 339) affirmed a death sentence imposed by a jury in the superior court of Cobb County. Upon writ of certiorari to the United States Supreme Court, this latter Court in an unprecedented procedure went wholly outside the record and transcript of the case and found imaginary procedural errors, not real errors which in fact existed and were shown to exist by the certified record in the case but imaginary errors which were conceived and born in the fragmentary imagination of one or more of the Justices. In that opinion of the United States Supreme Court, the Court said that an error might have been committed when such an allegation did not appear in the statement of the case nor in the assignments of error—and they could not have so appeared because they did not so exist.

Among other things the laws of the State of Georgia, on the question of jury selection, provide as follows:

59-101. (813 P. C.) Jury commissioners; appointment; number; qualifications; terms; removal: In each county there shall be a board of jury commissioners, composed of six discreet persons, who are not practicing attorneys at law nor county officers, who shall hold their appointment for 6 years, and who shall be appointed by the judge of the superior court. On the first appointment two shall be appointed for 2 years, 2 for 4 years, and 2 for 6 years, and their successors shall be appointed for 6 years. The judge shall

have the right to remove said commissioners at any time, in his discretion, for cause, and appoint a successor. (Acts 1878-9, p. 27; 1887, p. 52; 1901, p. 43.)

59-103. (815 P. C.) Same; oath, entry on minutes of court of ordinary: Jury commissioners, before entering on the discharge of their duties, shall take and subscribe before the ordinary of their respective counties, the following oath which shall be entered on the minutes of the court of ordinary, viz: "You shall faithfully and impartially discharge the duty of jury commissioners for the county of _____ in accordance with the constitution of this State, to the best of your skill and knowledge; and the deliberations and counsel of the jury commissioners, while in the discharge of their duties, you shall forever keep secret and inviolate unless called upon to give evidence thereof in some court of justice of other legal tribunal of this State. So help you God." (Acts 1832-3, p. 101.)

59-104. (817 P. C.) Same; clerk of superior court as clerk of the board; oath, duties: The clerk of the superior court shall be the clerk of the board of commissioners, and shall perform all the clerical duties required by law. Before entering upon the performance of his duties as clerk of said board he shall take an oath, before the ordinary, to faithfully discharge his duties as required by law, and that he will never divulge, any of the proceedings and deliberations of the jury commissioners, unless compelled to testify thereof in some court in this State. (Acts 1878-9, p. 28; 1882-3, p. 101.)

59-201. (811 P. C.) Qualifications of grand jurors; incompetency of certain public officers to serve: All citizens of this State, above the age of 21 years, being neither idiots, lunatics, nor insane, who have resided in the county for six months preceding the time of serving, and who are the most experienced, intelligent, and upright persons, are qualified and liable to serve as grand jurors, unless exempted by law: *Provided, however*, That county commissioners, tax receivers, tax collectors, members of the county board of education, county school commissioners, ordinaries, and county treasurers shall be incompetent to serve as grand jurors during their respective terms of office. (Constitution, art. VI, sec. XVIII, par. II (sec. 2-4502), Acts 1887, p. 53.)

59-202. (812 P. C.) Number of grand jurors: A grand jury shall consist of not less than 18 nor more than 23 persons. (Cobb, 547. Acts 1869, p. 140.)

59-701. (856 P. C.) How drawn and summoned: Petit juries shall be selected, and their names placed in a box, as provided in sections 59-106 and 59-108. At the same time, and in the same manner, that grand juries are drawn, the judge of the superior court shall draw out of the same compartment of the jury box 36 names to serve as petit jurors for the trial of civil and criminal cases; and such petit jurors shall be summoned in the same manner as is provided in section 59-206 for summoning grand jurors. (Acts 1869, pp. 139, 140; 1878-9, p. 27.)

59-703. (857 P. C.) Panels, how made; procedure where parties do not agree on panel; striking jurors: The judges of the superior courts, at each term, shall, from the petit jurors, have made up 2 panels of 12 jurors each, which shall be known and distinguished as panels "number one" and "number two"; all cases in said courts shall be tried by one or the other of said panels if the parties shall agree upon a panel. If the parties shall not agree upon a panel, the clerk shall furnish the parties or their attorneys a list of both panels, from which the parties of their attorneys may strike alternately until there shall be but 12 left, which shall constitute the jury to try the case. In all cases the plaintiff shall have the first strike. (Acts 1869, p. 141.)

59-704. (858 P. C.) Parties entitled to full panels; filling panel with tales jurors: In civil cases and cases of misdemeanors in the superior court, each party may demand a full panel of 24 competent and impartial jurors from which to strike a jury, and when one or more of the regular panel of traverse jurors shall be absent or for any reason disqualified, the presiding judge, at the request of counsel for either party, shall cause the panel to be filled by tales jurors to the number of 24, before requiring the parties, or their counsel, to strike a jury. (Acts 1878-9, p. 145.)

59-706. (860 P. C.) Oath of panels of jury: Each panel of the petit jury shall take the following oath: "You shall well and truly try each cause submitted to you during the present term, and a true verdict give, according to the law as given you in charge, and the opinion you entertain of the evidence produced to you, to the best of your skill and knowledge, without favor or affection to either party, provided you are not discharged from the consideration of the case submitted. So help you God." (Acts 1869, p. 141.)

I regret to lengthen the record and belabor you who might be listening with an enumeration of these code sections, but I want them made a part of the record at this time so that anyone interested might know the statutory requirements and procedures which are provided for and followed in the courts of my State.

We are proud of our courts and the constitutional and statute provisions and system of jurisprudence under which the courts of Georgia are operated. I have practiced considerably in the courts of Georgia, other States, and in the district courts, circuit court of appeals, and Supreme Court of the United States since 1938, and I might add that I was quite active in both office and courtroom practice until my election to Congress—excepting, of course, the time I served in the Armed Forces of our country, and even then I performed my full share of duty as trial judge advocate, trial counsel, defense counsel, and member of many general and special courts-martial; and I believe that I am qualified to compare Georgia courts with not a few but with many others.

Of all the courts in which I have practiced, and all the others which I have seen in operation, there is none which more zealously protects and defends the rights of the accused and—and I emphasize—the rights of the victims, too, than do the courts of the State of Georgia, without fear of favor, and without regard to the race, creed, or color of either the accused or the victims.

I am devotedly proud of my State and its people, and I am equally proud and jealous of the courts of my State and our system of law and jurisprudence. They need no defense from me or anyone else, but I would be derelict in my duty as an American citizen, a Georgia citizen, and a Member of Congress from Georgia, if I did not here and now openly and without apology denounce the unprecedented arrogation of powers unto themselves by the Supreme Court of the United States in its recent decision in the *Reece* case and by the Department of Justice in its unwarranted encroachment upon the prerogatives and duties of the superior court of my State.

I denounce these actions, and I condemn them as usurpations of power by the Federal judiciary and Federal Justice Department which are more reminiscent of Germany under Hitler and Russia of today than they are of orderly procedure under the constitutional Government of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon you and upon every Member of this House to solemnly consider the full impact of what has happened in this case. If the Supreme Court and the Justice Department of the United States can drive a wedge into the court system of the State of Georgia, not on facts which really exist but upon pure figments of the imaginations in the minds of utopian dreamers, and thereby weaken or seek to destroy the judicial and court system and rules of law and procedure of our State to any degree, however small, and go unchallenged by us, then the next step by arrogant, power-mad groups, will be to seek to break down and destroy every last and remaining vestige of local self-government and local self-determination.

Never send to know for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for you.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish every Member of the House of Representatives were here on this occasion—particularly do I regret that not more of the lawyer Members of this body, of whom there are so many, are not present at this time. I believe the Members of the House know the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] and I believe every one of them will agree that he is as even-tempered a man as there is in this distinguished body. Before coming to the Congress that gentleman was a prosecuting attorney in the State of Georgia, and, I believe, in fact, I know, Mr. Speaker, that he represents and typifies our courts in the State of Georgia. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I would like to put our Georgia delegation on trial before the bar of judgment of the Members of this House, and let the House say whether we are even-tempered and fair. Actually, when you see the Georgia delegation, what you are really seeing is a delegation which composed the courts of Georgia before coming to Congress. I was a prosecuting attorney for 27 years. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] is also a veteran prosecuting officer. The gentleman, Mr. DAVIS is a veteran jurist, in fact, the Georgia delegation are almost all veteran lawyers. I gladly put each one of us on trial and ask all of them—at any time did we deny any prisoner before the bar his constitutional rights? Did we ever fail to give any defendant a fair trial? I throw that out to the entire NAACP and the Anti-Defamation League and the other busybodies and people who are engaged in destroying law and order in the United States of America. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the saddest days that has ever occurred since this country came into being because we now have the unfortunate situation where the Justice Department of the United States has become particeps

criminis in an attempt to destroy all of our landmarks and all of our law and all of our order. I say that because of the fact I was a prosecuting attorney for 27 years and I make the charge and I dare them to deny it—the only purpose they could possibly have in interfering with our Georgia jury system is either to prejudice the case now pending before the court, and I say shame—shame, for never can they make the charge or point their finger at any prosecuting attorney or judge in the State of Georgia and say that that has ever occurred. We do not prejudice cases by conduct. Disgraceful—yes, disgraceful. If the attorneys for the Justice Department were running for office in our State, the people of Georgia would spew them out of their mouths—they would never win a single election. The only purpose they could possibly have in interfering here, is, as I have said, either to prejudice the case that is now pending before the courts or to free a confessed rapist who was already in the penitentiary for two other sexual offenses. There is no doubt about his guilt. It is only the appeasing of people in this country who have no interest whatsoever in the preservation of this country, and are concerned only with their selfish ends.

I think all of our Members from Georgia can maintain their equilibrium, and we are deserving of the support and assistance of all Members of this Congress. They should join with us and say to the Department of Justice, say even to the Supreme Court, "We simply will not tolerate a decision holding that a person must be granted a new trial because he had no attorney furnished him before the indictment."

Mr. Speaker, after 30 years in the practice of the law, I know it was not uncommon for defendants not to have an attorney until after they were indicted. If there was no indictment they hired no attorney. It is in contrast with the law, in contrast with order, and in contrast to public decency; and shame, shame it is how low the Supreme Court of the United States and the Department of Justice has fallen.

I love the law as a mother loves her first born. It was good to me, and I get down in sackcloth and ashes because I see a movement today that will destroy our courts, the only medium where the vicious and the meek can come together on equal terms—a sad thing, deplorable day in America.

Yes, I say to the gentleman from Georgia, we hope we can maintain our courts, and other States can maintain theirs. But—if rape is no longer a serious consequence to the Justice Department, and its concern is only to kowtow to groups having no regard for law and decency, we will not take it lying down.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] upon the manner in which he has presented the almost unbelievable set of facts which he has just called to the attention of the

House. This is just one more in a series of events which demonstrates beyond question that there are some people who still hate the South.

I remind the gentleman that some 3 years ago a case arose in Pennsylvania involving another Negro who had escaped from the penitentiary in the county where this prosecution occurred, Cobb County, Ga. In that particular instance there was no race question involved insofar as an offense being committed by a member of one race against a member of another race. In that case a Negro man had murdered his common-law wife and did not deny his guilt. He had come into court confessing his guilt, but under the procedure prevailing in the State of Georgia he had entered a plea of "not guilty," because the solicitor general and the judge had only one means of giving him a sentence of life imprisonment for the offense of murder. In the State of Georgia, if there is no recommendation for mercy, it is mandatory upon the judge to impose a sentence of death by electrocution. In that case they permitted the defendant to enter his plea of "not guilty," and the jury returned a verdict upon the facts, finding him guilty, with a recommendation for mercy. He was sentenced, and there was nothing irregular whatsoever about the trial. He went to the penitentiary to serve his sentence and he escaped and fled to Pennsylvania. In Pennsylvania he was apprehended, and the State courts of Pennsylvania, both the trial court and the superior court denied his application for habeas corpus, holding that he would have to return to Georgia to serve his sentence. He then filed a petition in the United States district court, and the trial judge in that court likewise held that there was no substance to his plea and that he must return to Georgia to serve his sentence under this valid court procedure. But it got up to the third circuit court of appeals, and one Judge Biggs wrote one of the most astounding, outrageous opinions which I have ever heard, holding that the State of Georgia was known to be so cruel to its prisoners that anyone who escaped was entitled to remain free. He handed down a decision holding that this defendant should be freed.

When that outrageous, unheard of, unspeakable decision was rendered in circuit court of appeals by this Judge Biggs I made a speech on the floor of this House on May 20, 1949, pointing out that such decision would become no precedent, because no court worthy of the name would ever have rendered it, and no court worthy of the name would ever follow it. The case went to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court reversed it and sent the defendant back to Georgia to serve his sentence.

This is simply one more instance to show that there is a concerted effort, particularly on the part of this Department of Justice to which the gentleman points eloquently, to ignore the law, to pander at any time and all times to this radical organization, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, many of whose officers have been shown time and time again

to have been members of Communist-front or other subversive organizations. It is simply an attempt by cheap politicians to pander to that group and those whom it represents in the effort to secure votes. I do not think they would be successful—and that is one thing which makes it all the more disgraceful, as they go to such lengths to pander to these vocal minority pressure groups purely for political purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the South today is facing its second reconstruction period. The Supreme Court with its fraudulent attempts to usurp legislative powers and the White House with its dictatorial Executive orders are teaming up to destroy States' rights and local self-government. This is another instance of the use of that power.

We were successful in preserving our constitutional rights in the first reconstruction period; they are in the balance again. This instance which the gentleman has just given to us here in the House emphasizes the need for the people who believe in States' rights and local self-government to shake off lethargy and indifference to these attempts to destroy States' rights and local self-government, and to organize strongly, to organize closely, to defeat such attempts as this on the part of would-be Federal dictators to go into our States and our counties under such a fraudulent, disgraceful excuse as has been used in this case and to interfere with the orderly processes of our courts and the administration of justice.

I compliment the gentleman on bringing this matter to the attention of the House and the country, and I join him in the protest which he is making.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BURLERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the other special orders.

UNWARRANTED INTERFERENCE IN STATE AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] for his presentation of the matter which he has just spoken of.

The Atlanta Constitution has revealed in its January 3, 1956, issue that Mr. J. K. Mumford, special agent in charge of the Atlanta office of the FBI, has admitted that he is conducting an investigation of the methods of selecting jurors in a State court in Georgia under orders from the Department of Justice in Washington.

This unwarranted interference in State affairs is a reflection on every official and every citizen of the State of Georgia.

The exact statement of the FBI agent is that "Warren Olney III, Assistant United States Attorney General, ordered

us to investigate all the facts surrounding the choosing of the jurors in Cobb County and we are carrying out his orders."

What purpose does the United States Department of Justice seek to serve in interfering with the legal processes and usurping the rights of the people of the State of Georgia? Never before has there been such interference in State affairs by an executive department of the Federal Government.

Are our local citizens to be allowed to live under their own State constitutions, to pass their own laws, to worship according to their own conscience, to educate their families, and to provide for an orderly community life by protecting the innocent against the violators of the laws?

Are we to profit nothing from the abuse of the police powers by the totalitarian governments, with the resulting enslavement of so much of the world population through their abuse of the police powers?

As a practicing attorney, I was closely associated with the State courts for many years. I had thought that our system of justice had worked well. I have always been proud of our jury system and of our courts in Georgia, which is not unlike the courts of the various States of my colleagues. It is a great public contribution when men leave their jobs and businesses to assume the obligation of public service through jury duty. There is no greater opportunity for community service, and no greater contribution to the preservation of law and order.

Our judges and lawyers have made great contributions to our judicial system, and I can think of no group of citizens who have devoted more of their time without compensation than our lawyers in order that every individual who appears before the bar of justice is adequately represented. There is no distinction between the persons who have appointed counsel. Every citizen is entitled to and receives legal representation without regard to his financial standing or ability to pay.

A court appointed jury commission makes up a list of jurors every 2 years from lists of taxpayers, some of which are put into the petit jury box and some of which are put into the grand jury box. Under this system, which is in accordance with the constitution and the laws of the State of Georgia, everyone who is brought to trial has the benefit of a fair and impartial jury. Those who live in Georgia know this to be true, and it is only through outside interference that any question of jury selection would arise in Georgia.

This incident should cause the Congress to once again reexamine the encroachment of the Federal Government into State affairs through judicial processes and by other means. Through heavy taxation by the Federal Government, leaving small sources of revenue to the States, the Federal Government is being placed in a position to restrict the States in the performance of functions which can best be performed at the local level.

Let us not forget that the Founding Fathers believed not only in a balance of powers between different branches of

the Federal Government, but also believed in a restriction on the abuse of Federal power through the exercise of certain governmental functions by the various States.

I happen to believe that local citizens in my State and every other State are quite capable of conducting their own local self government, and I further believe that the State courts should forever remain as a part of local government, and free of Federal control, as the best means of insuring that these courts mete out justice.

This would be an excellent time for our Federal courts to return to the practice of rendering judicial decisions, for our Federal courts to again follow judicial precedent in rendering decisions, and for our Federal courts to confine their activities to judicial decisions and leave to Congress the business of writing legislation, and to stop rendering sociological decisions as was done by the Supreme Court in the Segregation case. This would also be an excellent time for the Department of Justice to confine its activities to those functions which properly belong to the executive branch of the Federal Government, and to stop interfering with the judicial processes of the States. This interference in Georgia today, if allowed to continue will not be confined to any State or any section.

THE SOUTH'S CASE FOR SEGREGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, some of the facts about desegregation—about integration, call it what you please—are just starting to come out. Until rather recently, the issue of desegregation, the issue of the Supreme Court of the United States living the daily lives of the people of our Southern States, has not been dealt with justly by the Nation's daily newspapers and by our news magazines. Only one side of this picture has been presented, with the Southern States of our land portrayed as the Simon Legrees of a modern era, a picture completely out of line, completely out of focus with the facts.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to the attention of all the Members of the Congress of the United States the great article entitled "The Southern Case Against Desegregation," written by Mr. Thomas R. Waring, editor of the Charleston News and Courier, and printed in the January issue of Harper's magazine.

The News and Courier is one of the oldest and greatest newspapers of our land, certainly one of the most forthright and plain spoken, certainly one of the last outposts of free journalism in an era when some of our publications print only

their own viewpoint or the news as it fits in with their viewpoint.

The News and Courier is printed daily in my home city of Charleston, S. C., and it consistently every day, every week, prints the news and states the facts regardless of the consequences. In its forthrightness, this newspaper and Mr. Waring in particular, as its editor, consistently backs up the factual efforts of its reporters. In short, the courage of the News and Courier runs deep and it runs consistently and reporters who bring in the facts and whose facts are printed have the assurance the boss will never let them down.

Now we have before us another example of the forthrightness of this famous old daily newspaper, in the form of Mr. Waring's article in Harper's magazine.

Desegregation has become the prize political football of our time, motivated chiefly by political ax-grinding, by politicians seeking the votes of the Negroes of the North and West and East.

Mr. Waring gets right down to the facts when he tells why the parents of white children in the South object to integration with Negro children in the public schools.

Mr. Waring cites the low health standards of the Negroes, low despite increasing education and consistently higher expenditures for public health. On the side of health, Mr. Waring says:

The incidence of venereal disease, for instance, is much greater among Negroes than among whites.

Next, Mr. Waring deals with home environment of the Negroes of the South and with their marital habits, and of these habits, he says:

On the average, 1 southern Negro child in 5 is illegitimate.

The next reason Mr. Waring gives as to why white parents object to their children going to school with Negroes is because of Negro crime. And, he says:

For many years crime in the South has been more prevalent among Negroes than among white people.

The final reason listed by our distinguished Charleston editor is intellectual development of the Negro. He pointed out that the United States News & World Report revealed that in Washington colored children are about two grades behind the whites in attainment. Mr. Waring says this discrepancy, he believes, "is about par for other communities."

But, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Waring does not stop here. He goes on to say that "some advocates of integration say the way to cure these differences is to let the children mingle so that the Negroes will learn from the whites. The trouble with this theory is that even if it works, a single generation of white children will bear the brunt of the load. While they are rubbing off white civilization onto the colored children, Negro culture will also run off onto the whites."

Mr. Speaker, I concur heartily with the statement of Mr. Waring that "slavery is so long in the past that nobody thinks of it any more" down South. I should add that nobody thinks of it any more but the professional troublemakers, the

professional integrationist, the people who are pushing the Southern Negro ahead entirely too quickly and making it more difficult than ever for Southern States to accord the Negro the well reasoned consideration and the gradual improvement of his racial lot that brings him forward from his days of servitude.

Too little has been said, entirely too little written about the fine things that Southern States have been doing to help their Negroes, to improve their educational facilities, to raise their economic and cultural status, all within the framework of segregation that contributes to a peaceful society in the South.

I well recall from some years ago the article in the Saturday Evening Post by Mr. Jack Alexander, the well-known writer, who authored a series on life in American cities in all parts of the country. Mr. Alexander went to Raleigh, the capital city of our sister State of North Carolina, and there he was tremendously impressed by the freedom enjoyed by Negroes, by the opportunities there for them as well as elsewhere in the South.

In my own State of South Carolina our Negroes enjoy their freedom and their relations with the whites have been peaceful, constructive and forward-looking. At least, they were, until the Supreme Court of the United States nullified States' rights.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Thomas Waring on his excellent article in Harper's Magazine, and to hold it up to Congress and the Nation as one of the few fact-finding articles thus far published anywhere in our country on the segregation issue.

Mr. Waring says that the attitude of the press in our great cities outside the South is almost entirely one-sided on the racial issue, that objective reporting has been abandoned, and that for facts it frequently substitutes propaganda.

And, the editors of Harper's Magazine are to be commended for printing Mr. Waring's revealing article. The editors of Harper's do not agree with Mr. Waring, but they accord him a hearing before the Nation. In an editorial in the same issue, the editors pointed out that "so far there has been almost no national discussion between the men of good will on each side of the issue. Until such a dialog can be stated, the angry men will dominate the field."

Certainly more light needs to be focused on the segregation issue, on the implications of the Supreme Court's willful wrecking of States rights. In Mr. Waring's article, the facts are there on why southern whites do not want their children to go to school with Negroes. Those facts are incontrovertible, and the Negroes know they are true. Yet, the troublemakers of both races, the leaders of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the white vote-seeking advocates of desegregation are trying to lead us onward down the road to racial chaos and strife.

I say to these troublemakers, Mr. Speaker, that the white people of the South are not taking this situation lying down and that we have literally just begun to use our resourcefulness to fight for the privilege of still choosing our own associates, in schools and in our private

lives. These troublemakers have never told the Negroes that in the main they and all the people of other races can go only as far socially and in education as others are willing to accept them, and that the Negro still must strive to win acceptance on his own and not by the force of Federal judicial usurpation of the powers of local and State governments.

In conclusion, congratulations to a great newspaper editor, Thomas R. Waring, for his article in Harper's magazine, and may his first article on the issue of desegregation not be his last. I commend the reading of that article, carefully, by all men of good will. I thank you.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the article appearing in Harper's magazine of this month:

THE SOUTHERN CASE AGAINST
DESEGREGATION

(By Thomas R. Waring)

Although the Supreme Court has declared that separation of the races in public schools is unconstitutional, few white southerners are able to accept the prospect of mingling white and Negro pupils. Resistance to the Court decree is stiffening throughout the region.

Many white northerners are unable to understand the depth of feeling in the Southern States, whose area is about a sixth of the Nation and whose population is roughly a fourth of the total. The purpose of this article is to try to put before the open-minded readers of this magazine the point of view of the southerner—whom the rest of the United States apparently cannot believe to be open-minded at all on the subject of race.

At the outset it is only fair to warn the northern reader that he may be infuriated long before he reaches the end. This, I suspect, is just as inevitable as the outraged feelings of the southerners when he reads the northern press with its own interpretation of the American dilemma. Both sides have been shouting at each other so loudly that it is difficult any longer to hear facts through the din of name-calling. If, in the course of speaking for the South, I should raise blood pressure among some northerners, I apologize for causing pain—with the hope that I may be able to reach northern minds that are truly open so that some good may come along with the discomfort.

The reader outside the South may, unfortunately, react in still another way. He may find it difficult, if not impossible, to believe much of what I say. To this I can only reply that as editor of a South Carolina newspaper with a circulation of 56,000, with 28 years of journalistic experience in both the North and the South, I have had to be in possession of accurate information on this as on any other subject covered in my work. Across an editor's desk pass, day by day and year after year, reports, letters, statistics—in other words, facts. By means of these facts, plus personal conversations with people from all over the world, an editor manages to keep in touch with public opinion.

It is the public opinion of the South that I am about to report. That opinion is a fact. It exists, and can be demonstrated. What I am saying is documented by facts and statistics. If these should seem to the reader to add up merely to bias, bigotry, and even untruth, I shall regret it. Facts, however, remain facts.

One of the reasons these facts may be unfamiliar—and therefore incredible—is the almost unanimous attitude of the national

press—daily and weekly—toward the subject of race. I read many newspapers and news magazines, and people send me clippings from others that I do not see regularly. From my observation, the testimony these publications print is almost entirely one-sided. While less violent than the Negro press—which understandably presents only the militant antisegregation case—the metropolitan press almost without exception has abandoned fair and objective reporting of the race story. For facts it frequently substitutes propaganda.

Furthermore, with the exception of a small coterie of southern writers whom northern editors regard as "enlightened," spokesmen for the southern view cannot gain access to northern ears. This article will be one of the few of its kind published in a magazine of national circulation. The South, alas, lacks a magazine or other organ with nationwide distribution.

Perhaps my first assertion of a seldom realized truth will be the most difficult to believe. This statement is that white southerners of good will—and the percentage of decency runs about the same in the South as anywhere else—favor uplift of the Negro, and that these white southerners are in the vast majority. If it is impossible to prove the percentage of decency among southerners, it is equally impossible to show that people in the North—or any other region—have a monopoly of it. But the South fears, and with reason, that the uplift is being forced at too fast a pace. The vagaries of custom and race taboos have many inconsistencies. The rules of segregation, both written and unwritten, change with conditions. And the sudden rewriting by the Supreme Court of regional laws and State constitutions has stirred as much resentment in southern breasts as would be aroused among northerners if suddenly their own freedom from race restrictions were denied by Federal fiat. (Do I hear a muffled cheer from one or two northerners who may take a dim view of mingling the races?)

Interference with sovereignty usually produces rage. In matters of education, the States long have been sovereign—until suddenly nine men have held otherwise.

Is it any wonder that the southerner is bitter over what he believes to be a flouting of the Constitution for political reasons?

Aside from legal questions—and they are deep and broad—the southerner believes that as a practical matter, he is better equipped by experience to cope with race problems than people from other regions, no matter what their intellectual or political attainments. One of the proofs that this belief is founded not merely on pride or emotional prejudice lies in the fact that northerners who spend some time in the South—not tourists or weekend visitors, but people who make their homes here—come rather sooner than later to agree that this is so. These transplanted northerners come to see that there are far more bonds of friendship and active, productive good will between the white southerner and his Negro neighbor than they had believed—or could believe until they became eye-witnesses and partakers of this relationship.

Although the South is both willing and eager to have the Negro earn greater acceptance on many levels—especially economic—it does not consider, for reasons that I shall submit, that mixed education is the way to achieve this acceptance—certainly not at this stage of affairs.

What may lie in the distant future is more than any of us can predict with accuracy. Southerners know that race problems are as old as history. While views and philosophies may change through the ages, some basic truths stand out like the Ten Commandments. Southerners are not yet ready to accept an eleventh, "Thou shalt not protect the purity of thy race."

THE CLASH OF CULTURES

Before going into the actual reasons for the southerner's objections to mixed education—before asking the burning question, how can the races best live together—let us examine for a moment the pattern of separation. It is a pattern that Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and at one time Dwight D. Eisenhower have favored as best for both races. In 1888, Henry W. Grady, Atlanta editor—described by Don Shoemaker of the Southern Education Reporting Service as a southern liberal of his time—summed up the situation as follows:

"Neither provincialism nor sectionalism holds the South together but something deeper than these and essential to our system. The problem is how to carry within her body politic two separate races, and nearly equal in numbers. [Since Grady spoke, the whites in the South have come to outnumber the Negroes 4 to 1, but the proportions vary greatly by neighborhoods.] She must carry these races in peace—for discord means ruin. She must carry them separately—for assimilation means debasement. She must carry them in equal justice—for to this she is pledged in honor and gratitude. She must carry them to the end, for in human probability she will never be quit of either."

While Grady's statements were made nearly 70 years ago and therefore are subject to the criticism that they do not reflect modern conditions, to many southerners they are true both now and for the future.

The presence of large numbers of Negroes—especially in the tidewater regions of Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia, and the plantation country of Alabama and Louisiana, Mississippi, and East Texas—means that the races necessarily live in intimate daily association. Why, then, should not the children of people who live in the same community—sometimes as close neighbors—attend the same schools?

Southerners believe they have valid reasons, aside from prejudice about the color of skin, for their insistence on sending white children to exclusively white schools. Without debating superiority of either race, they are keenly aware of cultural differences. In some ways the standards of white people are none too high. The same economic conditions that have held back Negroes have worked against the whites. The increasing prosperity of the South is removing some of these disadvantages for both races, though not necessarily in precisely the same way.

Whether all the differences will eventually be removed, or enough of them to make mixed education acceptable to a substantial number of white people, the differences are too great at present to encourage white parents to permit their children to mingle freely in school. This has nothing to do with the frequent practice of children of both races of playing together when young, or with cordial relationships in many other contacts of ordinary life.

Volumes could be written on racial differences from many angles, including anthropology and sociology. I shall merely try to summarize five of the differences that most immediately come to the minds of white parents in the South. These are health; home environment; marital standards; crime; and a wide disparity in average intellectual development.

1. Health: Negro parents as a whole—for reasons that white people may sympathetically deplore but which nevertheless exist—are not so careful on the average as their white neighbors in looking after the health and cleanliness of their children. The incidence of venereal disease for instance is much greater among Negroes than among whites.

Statistics to document this statement are difficult to come by, though the statement itself would be generally accepted in the

South. The United States Public Health Service some years ago quietly stopped identifying statistics by races. South Carolina figures, available for 1952-53, give a clue to the situation in that State; it probably is much the same elsewhere in the South. Out of a population 60 percent white and 40 percent Negro, 6,315 cases of syphilis were reported, of which 89 percent were among Negroes. Infection with gonorrhea was found in 6 Negroes to 1 white person, but some physicians report that many cases of gonorrhea among Negroes go unrecorded.

During the same period—1952-53—a campaign against venereal disease was carried on, county by county. A spot check of four representative counties in different parts of South Carolina showed that cases of syphilis were found among 1.3 percent of the white persons examined. This was a fairly constant percentage. The percentage of infection among Negroes ranged in the same counties from 8.5 to 10.8 percent, averaging more than 9 percent.

Pastidious parents do not favor joint use of school washrooms when they would not permit it at home—and there's no use to tell them that it is unlikely that anyone will catch venereal disease from a toilet seat. They just don't want to take risks of any kind with their children.

2. Home environment: For most colored children in the South the cultural background is different in many ways from that of their white neighbors—and while these differences may have various explanations, they add up in the public's mind as racial. Slavery is so long in the past that nobody thinks about it any more, but the master and servant, or boss and laborer, relationship between whites and Negroes is still the rule rather than the exception. The emergence of a middle class among the Negroes has been extremely slow—again, the reasons count for less in the minds of white parents than the fact itself. Indeed, the professional and commercial class among Negroes is so small that its members are in perhaps the most unenviable position of all. They have progressed beyond the cultural level of the vast bulk of their own people, but are not accepted among whites, who fear to let down any dikes lest they be engulfed in a black flood.

Someone may suggest that here is an opening wedge for integration in the schools, by admitting a few well scrubbed and polished colored children of cultivated parents. In reply, let me say that this would be no more acceptable to the colored people than to the whites. The solution, perhaps—as it is among upper-bracket white people who do not send their children to public schools—might be private schools for prosperous Negroes as for prosperous whites. In any case, white people feel that cultural gaps on other levels should be filled in before discussing integrated schools.

3. Marital habits: Among many southern Negroes they are, to state it mildly, casual—even more so, in fact, than among the often-divorced personalities of northern café society. Many Negro couples—the statistics are not readily available, for obvious reasons—do not bother with divorce because there was no actual marriage in the first place. Statistics on the results of such casual unions, however, are available. On the average, 1 southern Negro child in 5 is illegitimate. It is possible the figure may be even higher, since illegitimate births are more likely to go unrecorded. Even among Negroes who observe marriage conventions, illegitimacy has little if any stigma.

Many white persons believe that morals among their own race are lax enough as it is, without exposing their children to an even more primitive view of sex habits. Moreover, while these parents do not believe there is any surge of desire among their offspring to mate with colored people, they abhor any steps that might encourage intermarriage.

They believe that lifting the racial school barriers would be such a step. Miscegenation has been on the wane of recent years. Whatever mixing of blood may have occurred—and admittedly that was due largely to lustful white men seeking out acquiescent Negro women—has been without benefit of either law or custom. On some levels of society, breaking the racial barriers might lead to mixed marriages. The mixture of races which white southerners have observed in Latin American countries gives them a dim view of legalizing cohabitation with Negroes.

4. Crime: For many years, crime in the South has been more prevalent among Negroes than among white people. Though the northern press no longer identifies criminals by race, white southerners have reason to believe that much of the outbreak of crime and juvenile delinquency in northern cities is due to the influx of Negro population. They believe the North now is getting a taste of the same race troubles that the South fears would grow out of mixed schooling, on a much bigger scale. They want no "blackboard jungles" in the South.

Maintaining order is a first concern of southerners. What they have heard about the fruits of integration in the North does not encourage them to adopt the northern race pattern. In Chicago, 300 policemen have been assigned for a year or more to guard a nonsegregated housing project, with no bigger population than a southern village where a single constable keeps the peace. In the county of Charleston, S. C.—with 190,000 population, nearly half Negro—the total law-enforcement manpower of combined city and county forces is 175.

While the homicide rate in the South is high, it is due in large measure to knifings and shootings among the colored people. Interracial homicide is relatively rare. (One of the reasons why the ghastly killing of Emmett Till in Mississippi made hot news—and some of that news was superheated and garnished with prejudice for the northern press—was the very fact that it was unusual. No lynching, as even most northerners now realize, has occurred in years.)

With racial bars down and rowdies of both races daring one another to make something of the vast increase in daily contacts, opportunities for interracial strife are frightening. Conservative, law-abiding people—and believe it or not, they constitute the bulk of southern whites—are deeply fearful that hatred and bloodshed would increase without separation of the races.

And they know that, in the long run, if there is riotous bloodshed it will be for the most part Negroes' blood. The thin tolerance of the ruffian and lower elements of the white people could erupt into animosity and brutality if race pressure became unbearable. Schools would be a focal point for such disturbance, first among pupils themselves and later by enraged parents. Instead of learning out of books, the younger generation would be schooled in survival—as several northern sources have told me already is happening in some areas of New York, Philadelphia, and Washington, D. C.

5. Intellectual development: Again for whatever the reasons may be, southern Negroes usually are below the intellectual level of their white counterparts. U. S. News & World Report—the fairest nationally circulated publication I am acquainted with in its treatment of the race issue—has reported that in Washington, colored children are about two grades behind the whites in attainment. This discrepancy, I believe, is about par for other communities. In Washington it was found that there were even language difficulties to surmount. The children used different terms for some things.

Some advocates of integration say the way to cure these differences is to let the children mingle so that the Negroes will learn from the whites. The trouble with this theory is that even if it works, a single generation of

white children will bear the brunt of the load. While they are rubbing off white civilization onto the colored children, Negro culture will also rub off onto the whites.

Few southern parents are willing to sacrifice their own offspring in order to level off intellectual differences in this fashion. They reason that their children will get along better in later life if they have, as youngsters, the best available cultural contacts. Such an attitude is not, I understand, altogether unknown in the North. Many parents in New York City, for example, make considerable financial sacrifices to send their children to private schools, to spare them the undesirable associations and the low-gear teaching standards of most public schools.

If this sounds snobbish to a northern reader, let me ask you to examine your own conscience. Can you honestly say that you are eager to send your own child to a classroom where the majority of other pupils will be considerably more backward in their studies, and extremely different in social background and cultural attainment? Which would you really put first: your theory of racial justice, or justice to your own child?

THE NEGROES' CRUSADE

In reply to objections to integration by white southerners, someone may ask: What about the Negroes? What do they think?

At the outset, let me say that as a person who has spent most of his life in the South, has known Negroes from earliest childhood, and as a newspaperman has been dealing with race matters every day for many years, I cannot say just what goes on in the minds of the Negroes. Nor do I believe that a white man can put himself in the place of a colored man any more than he can, by taking thought, add a cubit to his stature. Until the school question became agitated in recent years, however, race relations on the whole were good. Since the agitation, relations are not yet bad in a broad sense—but they are not improving by reason of the crusade for integration.

The leadership in that crusade comes from outside the South. It is sparked by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Southerners have reason to believe this organization has a very large measure of white influence among its leaders. They recognize that both major political parties are courting the Negro vote, which holds the balance of power in key cities of populous Northern States. They are bewildered by the array of power aligned on the side of the NAACP in press, pulpit, and politics. The NAACP and its allies seem well supplied with money. They have won legal victories and they are not disposed to compromise on any front. In fact, the NAACP seems—to white southerners—more interested in forcing the Negro into the white man's company than in equipping the Negro to qualify fully for such association.

A small but pointed illustration occurred in Charleston when a white community theater group tried to produce *Porgy* (the original play, not the opera) with a Negro cast in the city where the story is laid. There was a grave question about how the community, in a time when racial agitation was so bitter, would accept a play performed almost exclusively by Negroes. Many difficulties had to be surmounted in casting and production. But the sponsoring group, in consultation with NAACP and other Negro spokesmen, decided to proceed, and spent a sizable amount of money getting the production under way.

One of the key questions was the seating of the audience. Under South Carolina law separate seating for the races is required. The chairman of the local NAACP chapter agreed in writing, I have been informed, to an arrangement for separate seating by means of a vertical line down the center aisle, whites on one side and Negroes on the

other. At the last moment, with the play already in rehearsal, the NAACP repudiated the agreement.

The Negro cast pleaded with the white sponsors to go through with the production in spite of the NAACP. By this time, however, it became obvious that the delicate circumstances had become too explosive and the production was canceled. A possible good-will gesture, opening a new line of communication, thus was halted because the NAACP would accept nothing less than complete integration—regardless of both State law and local custom.

Whether the NAACP really speaks for the rank and file of Negroes is debatable. Public expressions of opinion from Negroes in the South, other than the NAACP, are relatively few. Some white people feel that a Negro is so accustomed to telling a white man what he thinks the white wants to hear, that they put little stock in whatever the Negro says on race. It would not be hard to believe that, given a choice, a Negro naturally would prefer all restrictions to be removed. That does not mean, however, that all Negroes want to associate with white people. Far from it; many Negroes prefer their own churches and, it stands to reason should be equally satisfied with their own schools, so long as an equal allotment of public money is given them.

While the allotment has not always been equal—Negroes pay only a small fraction of taxes—the sums of money spent on Negro schooling have increased by leaps and bounds. On the average the South spends a greater percentage of its per capita income on schools than other regions, and nowadays the Negroes are getting their share in most areas. One thing is certain: if the schools were integrated, many a Negro school teacher would lose his or her job. Even if the white people would accept mixed pupils—and few apparently would do so—they would insist on white teachers.

Whenever a southern Negro does object to the drive for integration, he is subject to pressure from his own people. Two Negro clergymen—what are known as "local preachers"—recently wrote letters to newspapers in lower South Carolina opposing the mixing of schools. Both were disciplined by their church superiors. Many white people on friendly terms with Negroes are convinced that as a rule, the Negroes are not eager for mixed schools so long as the schools for Negroes are adequate.

BOOTLEG SEGREGATION?

This conviction leads them to hope that a voluntary approach eventually may help to solve the problem within the Supreme Court ruling. Judge John J. Parker, of Charlotte, N. C., senior judge of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, has said:

"It is important that we point out exactly what the Supreme Court has decided and what it has not decided in this [the Clarendon County] case * * *. It has not decided that the States must mix persons of different races in the schools * * *. Nothing in the Constitution or in the decision of the Supreme Court takes away from the people freedom to choose the schools they attend. The Constitution, in other words, does not require integration. It does not forbid such segregation as occurs as the result of voluntary action. It merely forbids the use of governmental power to enforce segregation. The 14th amendment is a limitation upon the exercise of power by the State or State agencies, not a limitation upon the freedom of individuals."

The Alabama State Legislature has set up a new basis for assignment of pupils which does not mention race, though its provisions might tend to keep white and Negro pupils apart. In South Carolina, a committee of 52 representative citizens is circulating a resolution—already signed by many thou-

sands—asking the State legislature to interpose its authority between the Federal Government and local school boards to maintain segregation. Such a move would be based on the 10th amendment to the United States Constitution, reserving to the States and the people all powers not specifically granted to the Federal Government.

These are only two of many tentative plans to get around the Supreme Court's decision by methods of law. Another proposal is revival of the principle of nullification, which States both in the North and South have used in years gone by. A recent example was the public disregard of prohibition. Segregation, perhaps, may be bootlegged in some regions. How that can be done is not immediately apparent—but the resourcefulness of the rum-runners and speakeasies was not foreseen by sponsors of the Volstead Act.

As in prohibition, there is danger that white hoodlums may enter the picture. Sporadic outbreaks of the Ku Klux Klan have been reported. To combat the lawless element, law-abiding white men—who are determined not to yield to pressures they still regard as contrary to the guarantees of the Constitution—have been forming protective organizations. These go under many names. In Mississippi, South Carolina, and some of the other States they are called Citizens Councils.

Much has been said about the adoption of economic pressure as a weapon by these white groups. In some instances Negroes have reported that their sharecropper contracts have not been renewed because they signed petitions to integrate schools. Other forms of pressure have been reported, and in some localities Negroes have retaliated with boycotts against white merchants who were active in the councils. White leaders of the resistance movements repeatedly have said they were not organizing boycotts and pressures against the Negroes and that they are determined there shall be no reign of terror as predicted by some of the Negro spokesmen.

Hodding Carter—one of a handful of southern writers granted access to the national magazines—has predicted that attempts to enforce integration in the public schools of Mississippi would be likely to create violence. White leaders are exploring many other avenues in hopes of preventing strong-arm methods from being tried. They fear also that the very existence of the public schools is in peril. Rather than accept mixed public schools, some white southerners may seek other means of educating their children.

Even if the schools are not abandoned, it seems unlikely that the white people will submit to heavy taxation to operate schools that many of them refuse to patronize. If they are not throttled outright, the public-school systems in some areas may be starved to death. The spread of resistance organizations, far from being the product of demagogues, is at the local level among ordinary people, without big-name leadership. School trustees and other officials are getting the message from the grassroots.

Acceptance of the Supreme Court's order in border States and lipservice in some other quarters have encouraged some advocates to believe that many southern communities soon will yield to integration. While the borders of the old Confederacy may narrow, the determination of white people in areas with heavy Negro population is not relaxing. Not only regions where Negroes predominate by 10 to 1 are rejecting the prospect of mixed schools. Pickens County in Piedmont, S. C., has the smallest number of Negroes (about 1 in 10) of any county in the State; its grand jury—most fundamental of all bodies safeguarding the people's liberty—has gone on record against mixed schools. On Edisto Island, at the opposite side of the State, where a white

face looks out of place, insistence on mingling would be almost academic. If any attempt were made to force white children into Negro schools, the white people would move off the island, or find other means of educating their children.

Talk about segregation may promote migration of Negroes from the South. Already thousands have left the cotton fields and villages to seek jobs in northern cities. On the farms, machines have replaced them. With the minimum wage advancing to \$1 an hour, southern employers will demand production from their laborers that not all Negroes will be able or willing to supply. These employers also may seek ways to mechanize or to employ white labor. As industries move South, more attractive opportunities for white people are opening.

If the North continues to appeal to Negroes as a land of integration and the South continues to attract white settlers, the racial proportions may grow more nearly equal. Then the North may become more tolerant of the southerners' view of race problems, and the South better able to handle its dwindling Negro problem. Southerners will gladly share the load.

Meanwhile, stripped of emotions, the race problem for both southern whites and Negroes is a practical matter of daily living. The problem has been recognized by thoughtful Americans from the early days of the Republic. It would be foolish to deny that any Negro pupils ever will enter southern white schools. (Some already have.) But it would be equally foolhardy to predict that their numbers will be significant at an early date.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The gentleman is doing a great service in inserting the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I wish to express my appreciation of that to the gentleman. I should like to ask one question of the gentleman from South Carolina. I believe he stated that the author of the article is a Mr. Waring.

Mr. RIVERS. I am glad the gentleman brought that question up.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I want to ask the gentleman if he is by any chance related to a Federal judge which the gentleman's State had by the same name.

Mr. RIVERS. Yes; he is related. Of course, they do not speak, because they do not have anything to speak about. He is a nephew of that degenerate who has found out that he cannot live in my part of the world, with all of his cronies passing him on the other side of the street. He has gone to that haven, that refuge, New York, where peace, law, and order are the order of the day. They do not have any lynching there. They do not shoot you with machine guns, they do not stab you, they do not ill-treat the Puerto Ricans there. It is a great place.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. He can be unsegregated there to his heart's content.

Mr. RIVERS. To his heart's content, yes; because water seeks its own level. And may God have mercy on his miserable soul. This man is a nephew of that degenerate whose absence in my city is much better than his presence there.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. LANDRUM. I want to compliment the gentleman from South Carolina and also to join the gentleman in complimenting my distinguished colleagues from Georgia, Hon. PAUL BROWN and Hon. HENDERSON LANHAM, for the splendid and forceful manner in which they have brought to the attention of this body the invasion of States' rights by our Department of Justice. I would like it to be brought to the attention of this body that the judge of the superior court being investigated by the Department of Justice, under the direction of the Attorney General, is a former Assistant United States Attorney for the United States District Courts in the Northern District of Georgia, who spent many years of loyal and vigorous service in the prosecution of criminals brought into the Federal courts in the northern district of Georgia; and because of his long and outstanding service this gentleman, Hon. James T. Manning, was elected by his people to be judge of the Cobb superior courts. Now, for the Department of Justice of the United States Government to go in and investigate the activities of the State courts first, and this distinguished jurist second, is a reflection not only upon the State of Georgia but particularly upon those people in the superior court circuit who, because of their confidence in him, elevated Mr. Manning to this position he now holds as judge of the superior courts. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for permitting me this time.

Mr. RIVERS. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia that we people in South Carolina do not run from a fight. We will stand side by side with you in your fight to preserve the dignity and the sovereignty of your great commonwealth and when you need help, we are just across the border—we fought before and we killed as many of them as they did of us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

HON. SAM RAYBURN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me may be amended so that I may proceed for such time as may be necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Texas delegation, it becomes my very happy privilege to direct the attention of the membership of the House of Representatives to an occasion tomorrow, which I know you will want to commemorate in some manner. Tomorrow is the birthday of a great American. It is the birthday of our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN. Over the years the records of this House have become full of eulogies and beautiful remarks regarding our Speaker and

colleague. From all over the country and from practically every Member of this body, that is every sitting Member as well as those who have passed through the portals of this Hall over the years, have come expressions of love and devotion they have for SAM RAYBURN since he became a Member of this body, and especially during his long tenure as Speaker of the House of Representatives. That feeling for our Speaker and that devotion to him is something we from Texas share with other parts of the country, and is something which people from other parts of the country, knowing him, join with us from Texas in paying tribute.

Throughout this great land SAM RAYBURN holds and deserves the respect of countless millions who recognize his able leadership; his high integrity and unexcelled statesmanship.

In my humble opinion the country should have long ago availed itself of this leadership by placing him in the highest office within the gift of the electorate. But the hour is not yet too late for the Nation to call upon SAM RAYBURN to occupy that great office, because men who know him trust him; they know his ability; they know his devotion to country; they respect his judgment; they feel safe in his leadership.

It is my wish, and I know all join me, in wishing for Speaker RAYBURN a happy birthday tomorrow and many more years of service to his country and his fellow man.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I am happy to yield to the Minority Leader.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman from Texas in his tribute to our beloved Speaker. We on this side recognize him as one of the great parliamentarians of all times, a man with equal justice for all; a man who upholds dignity and justice; one who ably upholds the great institution of Congress. Upon his birthday I am happy to join his legion of friends in felicitations. May he be blessed with many more years of good health.

Mr. BURLESON. I am very grateful to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I feel confident that I express the true sentiment and feeling of all Members of the Tennessee delegation in Congress and all the people of the State of Tennessee in joining our distinguished colleague and others in extending our felicitations and hearty congratulations to our beloved Speaker. We take great pride in the fact that SAM RAYBURN was born in Tennessee. He has taken his place among the great of all Americans of all times, and we certainly wish him many happy returns of the occasion on his birthday tomorrow.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that I happened to be on the floor when the gentleman from Texas called to our attention the impending birthday of our great Speaker.

As I look back over the past 10 years I have been privileged to serve in the House, I think perhaps the greatest blessing that has come to me has been that I have been privileged to serve with the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, and to serve under him as Speaker. As a matter of fact, it has been my great privilege to serve under two great Speakers during those 10 years, two men who will go down in history as great Americans.

I have often said of our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, that of all the men I have known in my 47 years, he came nearer to having infallible judgment than any man I have ever known. I have seen him face difficult decisions, and without doubt he would come up with the correct answer with more readiness and inspire more confidence in those who were awaiting his judgment, than any person I have been privileged to know in my lifetime.

I am extremely happy on this day that he is with us for another year. I hope and pray that he may be privileged to be for many years to come; that he will remain strong in body and mind, and continue to shed his wisdom and his guidance among the Members of this great body.

Mr. BURLESON. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, SAM RAYBURN is one of the finest and greatest characters I have ever known. He is a great American, a true and wonderful statesman.

I hope the future will continue to bring the Speaker good health and much happiness and everything good in life.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the dean of the Illinois delegation the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, who not later than last night while we were assembled, expressed his profound gratitude to have had the opportunity to associate with our beloved Speaker, I am privileged to say on the floor of the House today that he regards SAM RAYBURN as the No. 1 Mr. America and Mr. United States. As a freshman, watching the Honorable Speaker through last year, I am reminded of that admonition that my dad made to me. He said, "Walk among tall men." He did not mean men who were gifted by reason of stature. He meant men who thought nobly and thought best and thought tenderly. I think in our Speaker we have a man who meets all of those admonitions. I think he represents a real contribution to the United States, and I think he will go down in history as a man who has made

many wonderful accomplishments and contributions to a better world.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman's remarks are appreciated.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Inasmuch as I seem to be the only Louisianian on the floor at this particular time, I do not wish to let this opportunity pass without having something to say about our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN.

I believe that I can truthfully say that I am joined by every member of the Louisiana Delegation in paying tribute to SAM RAYBURN and wishing him many more happy birthdays.

I join my colleagues and the minority leader, Mr. MARTIN, in all the good things they have said. SAM RAYBURN is truthfully a great American and is recognized as such by all those who know him.

He has been helpful to many a young Congressman in his first days on this floor, and I for one wish to say that he was very helpful and kind indeed to me, not only as a freshman Member, but at all times.

Mr. RAYBURN has many warm friends in the great State of Louisiana and I join with them and his many friends throughout the Nation in wishing him many, many more happy birthdays, health and happiness.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana very much for his remarks.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I shall be glad to yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, SAM RAYBURN is not only one of the great Speakers of the House, not only one of the outstanding statesmen of his time, but he is also one of the most beloved men in public life today.

SAM RAYBURN has served longer as Speaker of the House than any of the long line of great and distinguished men who have preceded him in that high office. Henry Clay, who held the longest service as Speaker up to this time, came to the Speakership through a revolution in American politics brought about by the sudden determination of the Nation to go to war in order to reverse its international policies. Speaker RAYBURN came to the Speakership up through the ranks, slowly, on merit, and on the strength of his invaluable service to the Congress and to the Nation.

When the history of the United States is reviewed, a hundred years from now, Speaker RAYBURN will rank not only as one of the greatest parliamentarians who has ever presided over the House, but he will also rank as one of the men who has exerted a more profound influence in molding thought, legislation, and national policy than many men outside the Presidency of the United States.

We congratulate him that he has reached this eminent position in such excellent health with prospects of many years of service ahead of him, and we wish for him a continuation of the great affection in which he is today held by this Congress and the American people as a whole.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his remarks.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of those of us who are rather early in our service in the House I want to take this occasion to express to our beloved Speaker our congratulations.

I think there is probably no other body, legislative or otherwise, in the world where those who come with very little experience can perform their duty as well as we, because we have had the guidance and the benefit of the wisdom and experience of our beloved Speaker. We are deeply appreciative of him, and I hope that God will be very careful of him and keep him with us for many, many years to come.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma for his courtesy, Mr. Speaker, as I would also like to extend my felicitations to Speaker RAYBURN. He comes second only in my heart and mind to our own Speaker, JOSEPH W. MARTIN.

I have enjoyed service with the Speaker all through the years I have been in Washington, and I have been in Washington for many years. Prior to my own incumbency in the House I always admired his great ability as a legislator, as a parliamentarian. I have enjoyed tremendously his humor. When things have been pretty hot, as they get sometimes in the House when feelings are running high, Speaker RAYBURN's humor has helped us over many a rough spot.

I want personally to express my own appreciation and also the appreciation of the people of my district for the help he has given us. He has helped us whenever he possibly could. I realize that I have often been insistent upon legislation and I appreciate the trials and tribulations he perhaps has gone through as a result of my insistence. It is very fortunate for the Members of the House to have two such great men among us as Speaker RAYBURN and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. It is a great tribute to both of them that they have served so long and well as Speakers of this great body and at the same time remain the best of friends, each admiring in the other the wonderful traits that they both possess.

May the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] have many, many happy years ahead of him. From the way he looks today I think he could live to be a hundred and easily remain with us as Speaker all of that time—if the Democrats remain in power.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for her very beautiful remarks.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in joining with my colleagues in extending felicitations to our beloved Speaker, I know that I represent my district in the truest sense of the word. Mr. RAYBURN lives within a few miles of my district. The people I represent know him well and love him. They refer to him affectionately as "Mr. Sam." They agree with me that he is the best qualified man in America to be President of the United States and are hopeful that the next Democratic convention will nominate him.

I love Mr. RAYBURN and I join my colleagues from Oklahoma in saying that we are always happy to have our constituents refer to him as that great Congressman at Large from Oklahoma. We wish him many more years of health, happiness, and outstanding service to this House and to our country.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the fact there are only three members of the California delegation on the floor at this time is only because we did not know in advance that this happy occasion was to occur at this hour so that we might have a more adequate opportunity to express our best wishes to the distinguished Speaker of this House, Mr. SAM RAYBURN on this birthday anniversary. So I take the liberty of saying on behalf of all of those from California who have not yet spoken and are not here that I am sure every Member from my great native State wishes our beloved Speaker a very long and happy life as Speaker as well as our beloved fellow American citizen.

We Californians appreciate his fairness and justice in all his relationships with us.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the gentleman from California are greatly appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the opportunity of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD in reference to the birthday on tomorrow of our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest Americans of all time is our beloved Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. What SAM RAYBURN has done as a Member of the Congress will always be a living part of the history of the United States. It is most fortunate for our country that we have men like SAM RAYBURN in the Congress of the United States during these trying days. His great ability, his years of experience, and his sound judgment have evidenced themselves on many occasions in steering the Ship of State. He is also one of the outstanding sound progressives of the great period of progress starting with the late President

Franklin D. Roosevelt and continuing under former President Harry S. Truman.

To me, SAM RAYBURN is also a close and valued friend. Between us during my years of service there has been a close friendship of a lasting nature. During the past 15 years we have occupied the position of leadership in the House of Representatives. The strong feeling of friendship and respect that I entertain for him is not only evidenced externally but is also possessed by me internally. On the occasion of his birthday anniversary this year, Mrs. McCormack and I extend to him our hearty congratulations and the hope that God will continue to shower upon him an abundance of his choicest blessings for many years to come.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and honor to join in the felicitations which come on January 6 to our beloved Speaker. It is a time when members of the Texas delegation are almost shouldered to one side by the innumerable people who wish to express their happiness that our Speaker has reached another milestone in his full and fruitful life. While we would not begrudge these other friends their chance to congratulate Mr. SAM, we, of the Texas delegation, claim an especial privilege on his birthday because this great American is our own. He is our people and we claim him not only as our colleague but as our guide, philosopher, and friend of many years.

We take a moment on his birthday to express a prayer of thankfulness to Almighty God for giving us Mr. SAM and for giving to us and to our country the benefit of his wise leadership through the perilous days of the past and present.

We look forward to many more years when we may all be blessed by the guidance of his wise hand.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, our beloved Speaker will enjoy another birthday tomorrow. All of us wish that he will enjoy many, many more. And, of course, we Democrats hope that he will celebrate most of them in his present position.

Few men have wrought such a great influence on the Nation's problems as has Speaker RAYBURN. His influence dominated the Congress long before he became Speaker. Since he was elevated to that position of leadership, his good work has been even more outstanding. His judgment and his efforts have always been on the side of the people and for the best interests of the country.

May he enjoy good health for many years to come so that he may continue to train the younger Members and thus give to the country more good, sound, and patriotic men like Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

GREETINGS TO SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join with my colleagues in extending greetings to you on the occasion of your 74th birthday. With it go my sincerest wishes that the year ahead may prove to be a very happy one for you and may it mark the fulfillment of your choicest dreams.

We are indeed very fortunate to have a man of your vision and stature at the helm of this body at a crucial time such as this. Knowing you as we do, I feel certain that under your guidance and leadership we can look forward to a year of fruitful accomplishments for the welfare of our Nation and of the whole world.

May the good Lord bless you with many more years of health and may we be privileged to enjoy your leadership and your wise counsel for many years to come.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join with my colleagues in extending felicitations to you on your birthday and to wish for you many more years of good health and happiness. We in the House need the continued guidance and distinguished leadership which you have given us for so many years and the country needs your continued loyal and devoted service. Many of us have profited by your gracious and wise council and all of us cherish your friendship. May the year ahead be a happy and fruitful one for you.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to join in the flow of oratory that is being directed at you on the occasion of your 74th birthday. But let me emphasize that these are not mere words we speak. As a member of the delegation you lead, and as a Member of the House you head, let me express my gratitude that we have in you a real representative of the people—a leader who guides with judgment rather than prejudice and with compassion and understanding rather than rancor. As we say on the Texas border, *Feliz cumpleaños*—Happy birthday—and many more to come.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues in felicitating our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, on the 74th anniversary of his birth.

It has truly been a privilege for me to serve with and to know intimately this great American. Everyone loves, admires and respects Mr. SAM.

"Mr. Democrat," as he is so well and often called, has rendered a service to his country beyond our power to express. My hope and prayer is that he may be spared for many, many more years of faithful and fruitful service.

Mr. RAYBURN, my heartiest congratulations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ENGLE, for next week, on account of official business.

Mrs. PFOST (at the request of Mr. ROGERS of Colorado), on account of illness in family.

Mr. LONG, for approximately 10 days, beginning Friday, January 6, 1956, on account of business.

Mr. GWINN of New York (at the request of Mr. MASON), for 10 days, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PHILBIN in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KELLY of New York, in the body of the RECORD, on the passing of Mrs. William H. Good, national committee-woman from New York, and that all Members desiring to do so have the same privilege.

Mr. DOYLE and include related material.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. RODINO) in two instances.

Mr. FORRESTER and include extraneous matter.

Mr. METCALF and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. MULTER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE.

Mr. BEAMER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDONOUGH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENSEN in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PELLY in two instances.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and to include a speech by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson.

Mr. BECKER and to include a statement. Mr. GAVIN on European observations.

Mr. LIPSCOMB and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include a statement by General Summerfield, Postmaster General.

Mr. HILL.

Mr. VANIK.

Mr. BOLAND to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD in connection with a bill he has introduced.

Mr. GATHINGS (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) to extend and include a letter he sent to Secretary Benson.

Mr. MCCORMACK in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY.

Mr. RODINO.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 9, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1323. A letter from the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, Department of the Navy, transmitting a report of agreements relating to operations in the Naval Petroleum Reserves for the calendar year 1955, pursuant

to the act of June 17, 1944 (58 Stat. 280); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1324. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Personnel and Reserve Forces), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to provide for the appointment and promotion of the director and assistant directors of the band of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1325. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the official operations of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to section 12 of the act approved June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 108); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1326. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, with regard to the disposal of foreign excess property, pursuant to section 404 (d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1327. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, relative to a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

1328. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize partial payment of certain claims which are certified for consideration of the Congress by the Secretaries of the military departments"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1329. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a statement of the adjudications rendered during the year 1955, pursuant to the act of July 2, 1948 (50 U. S. C. App., secs. 1981-1987), amended by Public Law 116, 82d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1330. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 9, 1955, submitting a letter, together with accompanying papers, on Ludington Harbor, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted December 4, 1939; to the Committee on Public Works.

1331. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1332. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report of the affairs of the Library of Congress, including the copy-right business, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; to the Committee on House Administration.

1333. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a report showing statistical tables reflecting the business transacted by the bankruptcy courts and other pertinent data for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, pursuant to section 53 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. 81); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1334. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting the 39th Annual Report of the United States Tariff Commission, pursuant to section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 8098. A bill to amend the act providing for Federal aid for State veterans' homes to permit payments to homes not primarily furnishing domiciliary care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 8099. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing import quotas under specified conditions and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 8100. A bill to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of Brazil; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 8101. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to give 25 World War II paintings to the Government of New Zealand; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 8102. A bill to provide for the disposition of moneys arising from deductions made from carriers on account of the loss of or damage to military or naval material in transit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 8103. A bill maintaining the 1955 burley tobacco allotment quota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 8104. A bill to authorize the transmission in the mails at the rate provided for books of cumulative folders containing individual school records of students in public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 8105. A bill to remove wheat for seeding purposes which has been treated with poisonous substances from the "unfit for human consumption" category for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 8106. A bill authorizing the construction of the Littleville Reservoir project, Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 8107. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 8108. A bill to provide for the development of a comprehensive master plan to abate and prevent water pollution in the District of Columbia and areas immediately adjacent thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 8109. A bill to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 8110. A bill to incorporate the National Music Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHER:

H. R. 8111. A bill to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of disability pension awards under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part III; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 8112. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 8113. A bill to provide for an elective Governor and an elective Lieutenant Gov-

ernor of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 8114. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 8115. A bill to authorize an increase of emergency relief highway funds from \$10 million to \$30 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 8116. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 8117. A bill to provide for Federal procurement of materials and supplies in major disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 8118. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 8119. A bill to increase the amount of appropriations authorized for disaster loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 8120. A bill to provide rent-free accommodations in certain federally aided housing for needy victims of major disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 8121. A bill to authorize the construction of additional flood-control reservoirs in the Connecticut River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 8122. A bill to provide authority to stockpile temporary housing for disaster relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 8123. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 8124. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 8125. A bill to amend section 5051 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to aid small business and discourage continued concentration in the brewing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 8126. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 8127. A bill to increase the education and training allowances under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 8128. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural products, to prevent unfair competition, to provide for the orderly marketing of such products, to promote the general welfare by assuring an abundant and permanent supply of such products by securing to the producers a minimum price of not less than cost of production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 8129. A bill to provide for national disaster insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H. R. 8130. A bill to designate the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River in the vicinity of Jones Point, Va., as the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 8131. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing import quotas under specified conditions and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 8132. A bill authorizing the preparation of detailed plans of the Littleville Reservoir on the middle branch of the Westfield River in Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 8133. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make the damage, disablement, or destruction of civil aircraft a criminal offense, with increased penalties in cases resulting in the death of passengers or other persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8134. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to authorize the imposition of the death penalty for sabotage of aircraft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 8135. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make the damage, disablement, or destruction of civil aircraft a criminal offense, with increased penalties in cases resulting in the death of passengers or other persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 8136. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 8137. A bill to establish a conservation-acreage reserve, to promote conservation improvement of agricultural soil, water, and related resources, to stabilize farmers' income, to adjust total agricultural production to consumer and export needs, to maintain an abundant and even flow of farm commodities in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 8138. A bill making an appropriation to enable the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission to formulate plans for the construction of a civic auditorium in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 8139. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for Erie of the western district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8140. A bill to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia, and to provide that such Commission shall continue in existence until the construction of such auditorium has been completed; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 8141. A bill to provide for a summer recess of the Congress in each year in which general elections are not held; to the Committee on Rules.

H. R. 8142. A bill to provide for national flood insurance and reinsurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 8143. A bill to extend coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, as self-employed individuals, to certain individuals who are employees of foreign governments and international organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8144. A bill to amend section 3A of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to reduce from 6 years to 5 years the service requirement for entitlement to an-

nulty thereunder; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 8145. A bill to appropriate funds for flood control and navigation projects in New England, preliminary examinations, surveys, and studies in New England, and surveys of hurricane damages along the eastern seaboard of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 8146. A bill to appropriate funds for certain authorized flood control projects in Massachusetts; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 8147. A bill to provide a more equitable system for the settlement of disputes arising from personnel actions in the classified civil service, and of grievances and complaints of all Government personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 8148. A bill to recognize naval service performed in sweeping the North Sea of mines in 1919 as service in World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 8149. A bill to amend the first sentence of paragraph (a) of section 756 of title 11 of the District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition (par. (a) of sec. 5 of the act of Apr. 1, 1942, c. 207, 56 Stat. 193), relating to the transfer of actions from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to the municipal court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 8150. A bill to provide for Federal disaster insurance and reinsurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 8151. A bill to establish a conservation acreage reserve, to promote conservation improvement of agricultural soil, water, and related resources, to stabilize farmers' income, to adjust total agricultural production to consumer and export needs, to maintain an abundant and even flow of farm commodities in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 8152. A bill to incorporate the National Society-Army of the Philippines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 8153. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 8154. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8155. A bill to increase the monthly rates of pension payable to widows and former widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 8156. A bill to establish a conservation acreage reserve, to promote conservation and improvement of agricultural soil and water resources, to stabilize farmers' income, to adjust total agricultural production to consumer and export needs, to maintain an abundant and even flow of farm commodities in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 8157. A bill to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 8158. A bill maintaining the 1955 burley tobacco allotment quota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 8159. A bill to amend section 5051 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to aid small business and discourage continued concentration in the brewing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 8160. A bill to deny tax-exempt status under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to any organization which engages in the promotion of litigation to which it is not a party; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 8161. A bill to establish a program of direct insurance of property by the Federal Government against risks and hazards incident to natural disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 8162. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 8163. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an amortization deduction for certain facilities constructed or acquired to replace facilities destroyed or damaged by a hurricane, flood, or other disaster; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 8164. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 8165. A bill to provide for national flood insurance and reinsurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 8166. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 8167. A bill to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 8168. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 8169. A bill to authorize the construction of flood protection measures, with particular reference to areas where severe damages have recently occurred as the result of extraordinary floods; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 8170. A bill making an appropriation to enable the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission to formulate plans for the construction of a civic auditorium in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 8171. A bill to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia, and to provide that such Commission shall continue in existence until the construction of such auditorium has been completed; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 8172. A bill to amend the marketing quota provisions of the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN PELT (by request):

H. R. 8173. A bill to amend section 5051 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to aid small business and discourage continued concentration in the brewing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8174. A bill to readjust size and weight limits on fourth-class (parcel post) mail matter at the post office at Oshkosh, Wis.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 8175. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Worker's Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 8176. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing import quotas under specified conditions and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 8177. A bill to provide for an experimental national flood indemnity and reinsurance program and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 8178. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. J. Res. 458. Joint resolution relating to burley tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DODD:

H. J. Res. 459. Joint resolution to establish a Northeastern United States Watershed Development and Flood Protection Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. J. Res. 460. Joint resolution, to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 461. Joint resolution to increase the appropriation authorization for the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Con. Res. 199. Concurrent resolution relating to commemorative ceremonies in connection with the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 200. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 353. Resolution to authorize the Committee on House Administration to conduct an investigation of campaign expenditures; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 354. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 355. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. Res. 356. Resolution providing for further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. Res. 357. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study the causes of the large increase in traffic accidents in the United States during recent years; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Res. 358. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the possibility of preventing hur-

ricane damage by breaking up or diverting hurricanes before they strike populated areas; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H. R. 8179. A bill for the relief of Don-Chean Chu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 8180. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Drina Sinovic and Vincence (Vincent) Sinovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 8181. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Lucie Leon (also known as Lucie Noel); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 8182. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rena Carmi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 8183. A bill for the relief of Ong Di Way, Ong Kow Won, and Mrs. Huie May Yew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 8184. A bill for the relief of Kreis Krzysztof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 8185. A bill for the relief of Chuzo Tamotzu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 8186. A bill for the relief of Miss Betti O. Bollmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 8187. A bill for the relief of Wright H. Huntley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 8188. A bill for the relief of Paolina Toscano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 8189. A bill for the relief of Liu Gun Cheung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 8190. A bill for the relief of Christa E. Holder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS (by request):

H. R. 8191. A bill for the relief of Anna Aldegonda Antoine Lescot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 8192. A bill for the relief of Charles Arnaiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES:

H. R. 8193. A bill for the relief of George Uhlig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 8194. A bill for the relief of Rose Mary Sproull; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8195. A bill for the relief of Filippo Pastore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 8196. A bill for the relief of De Lisle Madure Crawford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 8197. A bill for the relief of Virendra K. Sondhi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 8198. A bill for the relief of Guisepina Yolanda Dondero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8199. A bill for the relief of Joaquin Barros Da Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 8200. A bill for the relief of Jose Domingo Quintanar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 8201. A bill for the relief of Clemen-cio Gumban Hechanova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH (by request):

H. R. 8202. A bill for the relief of Basiliki Andre Giannoulas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 8203. A bill for the relief of Gildo Nicolio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 8204. A bill for the relief of Yi Nyong Suk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 8205. A bill for the relief of Fred Gordon Ralph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO (by request):

H. R. 8206. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Mancino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H. R. 8207. A bill for the relief of Ella Takasey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 8208. A bill for the relief of Edith Kaspersky and her minor child, Christine Kaspersky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 8209. A bill for the relief of Kurt Grossman and Mrs. Theresa Grossman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 8210. A bill for the relief of Olavi Kurko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 8211. A bill for the relief of Josephine Fan, Joseph Fan, and Joan Fan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 8212. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Juana Gaytan de Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8213. A bill for the relief of Maria del Socorro Garcia Ballesteros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 8214. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria D. Herren and infant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 8215. A bill for the relief of Edward Kammauf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8216. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lidie Kammauf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 8217. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Rousos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 201. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

406. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of residents of Canton and Bradford County, Pa., favoring passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

407. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolutions passed by the New Jersey State League of Municipalities at the 40th annual league conference held in Atlantic City, N. J., concerning Federal surplus property, Federal taxation of municipal and public agency bond income, national highway program, limiting openings of Burlington County bridges, and Federal payments in lieu of

taxes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

408. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

409. By Mr. LeCOMPTE: Petition of numerous citizens of Oskaloosa, Fremont, and University Park, Iowa, favoring passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

410. Also, petition of numerous citizens of University Park, Iowa, favoring passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

411. By Mr. MASON: Petition of Mrs. Anna H. Russell and 323 other residents of De

Kalb County, Ill., urging the enactment into law of H. R. 4627 and S. 923, bills to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages over the radio and TV, and in magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

412. By Mr. MUMMA: Petition of Mrs. R. C. Leitner and 20 other residents of Harrisburg, Pa., urging enactment of legislation prohibiting the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

413. Also petition of Margarette R. Mumma and 23 other residents of Harrisburg, Pa., urging enactment of legislation prohibiting the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

414. Also petition of Mrs. Harry K. Miller and 89 other residents of Hummelstown, Pa.,

urging the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

415. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Rev. Ernest Hart and other citizens of Springfield, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

416. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Wisconsin Federation of Young Republicans at its December meeting, urging that the principles of the McCarran-Walter Act be upheld; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

417. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Clifford Crail, Cincinnati, Ohio, with reference to a grievance and requesting a committee of Congress to investigate Hon. Frank J. Lausche, Governor of Ohio, and Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, etc., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Farm Problem: Do We Need a New Approach?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "Do We Need a New Approach?" which I delivered before the Texas Farm Bureau annual convention at Fort Worth, Tex., on November 8, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When I tried to put a title to the things which I wanted to discuss with members of the Texas Farm Bureau, I jotted down many suggestions that strongly appealed to me. I would have enjoyed, for example, spending my whole time talking with you about the problems of cotton, the need for decisions on cotton acreage in old areas and in new ones. I would have been happy to have discussed price cycles in the cattle trade. And as you can well imagine, I could have spent most of an afternoon examining with you the history of our whole program of price supports, acreage limitations, and marketing quotas.

I still feel that before another year rolls around I will have tried to reduce to writing what I know of the history of the long battle over price-support programs and levels. This battle is not something that can be dealt with casually in a few minutes. On the contrary, it has roots which run back to the days of the Federal Farm Board in the early 1930's—yes, even to the 1920's and the fight for the McNary-Haugen bills.

Through the fabric of that whole experience, through the changing patterns of processing taxes, soil-conservation payments, limited price-support operations, production payments, high-incentive prices and flexible price-support programs, there runs like a red thread one constant question from farmers in time of economic strain and financial difficulty: Do we need a new approach?

So I have taken that as a title and will talk about it today.

The minister rises in his pulpit and announces his text. He may travel far from it, but it is always there in case he wishes to return and avail himself of that anchor. I, too, have a text, and it is this chart prepared by the Agricultural Marketing Service in the Department of Agriculture following the form and pattern of a pencil sketch which I sent to the Service months ago and requested a reproduction in exact graphic proportions. I present it with no apologies, because I have studied figures and tried to draw from them crude charts as a means of graphic presentation almost as long as I have been in business.

This chart that I use today attempts to trace the relationship between national income and farm income over the past 45 years. By it, we see that beginning in 1910, particularly through the 5 years 1910 through 1914 which became the parity base for our earliest endeavors toward equality for the farmer, farm income and national income rose and fell together. I do not refer to actual dollars and cents, because farm income is only a fraction of national income, usually about from one-twelfth to one-fifteenth; but, nonetheless, they travel in the same relative pattern.

Then came the period prior to our entrance into World War I when those European nations which had been drawn into the conflict required enormous quantities of American farm products. Wheat prices rose to unprecedented levels as the armies in Europe surged back and forth over the hundred battlefields, digging trenches, developing barbed wire entanglements, tearing up the soil.

This was the great American era for ripping up pastures and plowing up the plains. I lived in the Dakotas, and my high school and college years were spent in an atmosphere of fervid agricultural expansion. Every available piece of land was put into wheat or corn. The Iowa farmer could turn a bumper corn crop into fat cattle which could be sold at such record levels that the value of Iowa farmland jumped from \$50 or \$100 an acre to \$400, \$500, and in Black Hawk County to \$600 or more. People bought and sold farmlands with the frenzy with which they now dabble in uranium.

There came, of course, a day of reckoning. The armistice was signed to end World War I. The pipelines of wheat and meat and dairy products no longer needed to be filled. The wheat farmer had no guaranty that his market would last forever and no umbrella to protect him in the day when his product

was no longer needed. Within a year after the close of the war, the boom was over and within 2 years the panic was on. There were six banks in my hometown. Five of them closed. The sixth was kept open by brute strength, but the whole agricultural economy was shattered and torn. You see that picture on the chart.

Then from 1921 for a period of 26 years farm income stayed relatively below but proportionately close to national income. It was never up to what we might call parity or equality except in the years 1924 and 1934, but it came close in the early 1940's and only dropped off in 1943, 1944, and 1945 when price controls worked more effectively against farm production than against the output of other segments of our economy.

The Congress tried to recognize that situation. It passed the Steagall legislation promising the farmer that he would have high, rigid price supports as an incentive to production during the period of the war, and that in recognition and reward for his stimulated and expanded production under price controls during the war he would have 2 full years after the war during which the Government of the United States would guarantee him adequate prices for his enlarged production. During these 2 years, of course, he was expected to adjust his production, to shrink it back to more normal levels and to prepare once again for the period when farm income and national income might move along together.

Now I am speaking of things that are within the orbit of my own acquaintance, because I came into the Department midway between the ending of the European and Japanese phases of World War II.

You see next on the chart a rapid lift in the relationship of farm income to national income, because we moved as rapidly as we could to eliminate price controls from the farm commodities and to give them a chance to reach their more normal relationship to farm income, but there were some clouds overhanging the farm price horizon. We had on hand 7½ million bales of ragtag cotton, cheap cotton that had moved under the Government loan at standard prices but had been of such inferior quality that it had not been taken out of warehouses for manufacturing into textiles. We had enormous stockpiles of butter, wool, fish, dried skim-milk powder, and a host of other things. We had thousands of cases of canned vegetables, millions of pounds of canned meats.

The problem then, and perhaps the problem now, was to move those commodities into markets other than the normal mar-